

Volume VII. OCTOBER, 1908. Number 4.

## The South Atlantic Quarterly.

### Education and Citizenship in a Democracy

BY WILLIAM P. FEW

Dean and Professor of English in Trinity College

In a democracy every man is an important and essential factor in the building or destruction of the nation; yet the leadership of ideas and ideals must come from a relatively small body of picked men. This body of picked men must be developed through some process and by some method. One of the processes to which most men look with hopefulness is education. Unless the schools and colleges can make a large contribution to this high leadership of ideas in the service of the republic, then education has a small mission in America; for education, like wisdom of old, must be justified of her children. The ranks of this chosen body have always been thin and are recruited with difficulty. Not every man who goes through school or even who has a college diploma enters this company of inspired and inspiring leadership. Education, like every other human agency, shows many failures.

There are certain admirable qualities that ought to belong to every genuinely educated man, whether his education was acquired through the processes of formal training or in the school of experience. Every educated man ought to have breadth of view and comprehensive sympathies. Man in his state of nature is a gregarious animal; in the next place he is a member of a clan; and in a later stage of his development he is an adherent of a faction, a sect, or a party. This blind championship of neighborhood interests, community feelings, inherited prejudices, and preconceived opinions, transmitted as it is from primitive conditions, is an inborn bias that is hard to resist; and the ability to see the other man's point of view and to enter into sympathy with him who holds antagonistic beliefs, is the surest mark and the final test of a cultivated man. The natural tendency to clannishness, partisanship, and separatism has caused many a

man in the past to devote to party or sect or faction gifts that were meant for mankind, and is responsible for the religious wars and persecutions of the dark ages which make up one of the saddest chapters in human history, as it is also responsible for the later warfare of science and religion, itself almost as destructive as the feuds of faith in the past. It is responsible, too, for sectionalism which curses all peoples, for the dissidence that sets men into warring camps, arrays the country against the town, creates social, literary, financial, and hereditary castes, breeds intellectual Brahmanism, and fixes impassable gulfs between innumerable factions that ought to stand shoulder to shoulder in the conflicts of modern life. That education is a failure which does not give one a speaking and working acquaintance with men good and true in every class and station. We have in our time lost something of the old ardor and intensity of other times; and we must make up for this loss by sympathetic and aggressive coöperation on the part of all good men in every cause that makes for progress and improvement.

Educated men ought to have the ability to think straight and to think through to right conclusions. This ability can only come from rigorous training of the mind and from what I shall call cogency of character. We need in this seething democracy to place a higher value on the mind, on the discipline of hard and constructive thinking, and on the practice of separating the operations of the intellect from those of the emotions. Our susceptibility to periodic attacks of national hysterics, the oft used power of sensational newspapers and alarmist popular leaders to "insurrect the public mind," and the lack of sound, hard-headed thinking among the masses leave us a prey to any wind of doctrine that may blow, whether it be a free-silver craze from the wild plains of Kansas, or an anarchistic propaganda from the back alleys of New York or Chicago. More than once in our history this emotional insurrection has threatened the wreckage of this republic; and there will never be any security against this sort of danger except in a large body of men with trained and solid mental capacity. Educated men and educational institutions ought to form a bulwark in this democracy against which the intellectual confusions and the surging passions of the hour shall beat in vain.

Close akin to, but not identical with, this power of accurate and just thinking is soundness of judgment, which applied to the conduct of life constitutes wisdom, that most useful gift vouchsafed to men on earth; and this wisdom is not the product of intellect alone, but comes out of a full harmonious character, and at its highest becomes a sort of moral instinct that almost compels a man to live his life wisely, just as the natural instinct compels the bird to build its nest. This highest wisdom, as I understand it, includes, first, the intuitive knowledge of men, that exposes cant, detests charlatanry, exalts true character and genuine excellence everywhere and is the best guaranty against the reign of the charlatan and the demagogue—for whose growing America probably affords the best soil in the world; and secondly, it includes the instinctive recognition of the eternal fitness of things, that discriminates between the important and the unessential, that discerns the means to reach the desired ends, and so prevents the waste of talent and effort which has rendered ineffectual the lives of so many gifted men.

Boswell quotes Dr. Johnson as saying: "Sir, you know courage is reckoned the greatest of all virtues; because, unless a man has that virtue, he has no security for preserving any other." Perhaps nowhere so much as in a democracy is courage necessary to preserve other virtues and make them efficacious in the community. Here where everything is in the end determined by public opinion it is of the first importance that the individual man shall have the courage to speak the thoughts that are in him and, when the time comes, to stand up and be counted, whether girt by friend or foe. As has been more than once pointed out, aristocracy tends to promote the growth of courage, but the leveling tendencies of democratic life do not foster the growth of moral courage. Every forward movement in a democracy is the result of striking an average of the intelligence and moral sense of all the people. It is difficult, therefore, for a democracy to find and develop its strong men and to give them the opportunity to exert their power. But a democracy can never be stronger than the individuals that make it up, and the individuals must act as individuals and not in the mass. Individuals swallowed up in the mass become the mob. Hence the need of courage in action in a democracy. But further than this, it is impossible to think

straight without the courage to face the issues of one's thinking. Without courage, thinking can have no moral energy; and as citizens of a democracy we are concerned with the moral energy of ideas rather than with their intellectual purity.

This is a political year and we are reminded that in the mere matter of casting votes, all over America we need not only honesty and intelligence, but also robust courage. In practical questions of government and political parties in a Southern State today, what should be the attitude of one who has no relations to politics other than those of an intelligent and interested citizen? Causes perfectly well known have produced here one great political party and one dominant school of thinking. This is our political inheritance; we should use it conservatively, and from our traditional position should make no departure unless we are convinced that we are moving towards something unmistakably better. But are not patriotic and courageous men when making up their minds how to vote coming more and more to ask what will be best for us and our section, and best for our nation, rather than settle questions as if they were matters of course, off-hand and in obedience to ancient sentiment? This abandonment of old issues, this burying of whatever is dead in the past, and the replacing of these old issues with candid and fearless searching after what is best for us and our section, would bring open argument and free discussion about business interests, politics, questions of our history, and all other matters of debate. There would be no toleration for the attempt to hush men's voices, as if by silence any defect in our society or limitation in our civil or social order might be overlooked. Wrong always needs exposure; for the more it is covered, the more it festers. Intelligent and fearless public opinion expressed through free speech and untrammelled ballots is the safeguard of a democracy. Before we can prosper as we should we must free ourselves from every vestige of political cowardice, and overthrow all attempts through abuse, through social ostracism, or through any other means, to browbeat one man into another man's way of thinking. We must be brave enough to vote as we think, without regard to the opinions of others and without regard to any consequences that may come



to us through registering at the polls our real convictions on local and national questions.

I do not mean to imply that this conception of the franchise would necessarily change any man's actual vote; but it would change the attitude of many of us towards the ballot, and would intensify the sense of responsibility that is imposed by the right to vote upon every thoughtful and conscientious man. It is a commonplace of American politics that this duty to cast an intelligent and conscientious ballot is held too lightly by educated men. And this is one of the perils that beset popular government.

An educated man should not only have, in as large measure as may be, sympathy, ideas, wisdom, and moral courage, but to make his influence widely effective for good in a democracy he must have the power of expression either through his speech or by pen. The noblest form of self-expression, as it is also the surest revelation of character, is that which runs itself out through the fingers into one's work, whatever that work may be. Only the man who has found adequate expression of himself, either through the product of his hand or his brain, can reach his complete development. It used to be said that one who has command of three languages is three times a man. I am not sure of this, but it would seem to be true that one is thrice great if, like Leonardo da Vinci, distinguished painter, sculptor, architect, engineer, and musician, he is a consummate practitioner of three arts, through which he may develop and express himself.

How is this developed individual to project himself into society and make his influence weigh down the scales on the side of progress? Apart from the transcending power of noble example, this can only be done through ideas, and ideas are best promoted in this democracy by men who can think clearly and write with distinction or men who have the gift of speaking with conviction and power. To bring about improvement we must convince the minds and appeal to the hearts of men; for nothing but opinion and sentiment can effect great permanent changes in a people. To change the complexion of a civilization there must be a slow, gradual change in public opinion. By public opinion I mean the conscious and unconscious thinking of men about duty and conduct, and the embodiment of this thinking in prevalent ideals of life in such a way as to shape the collective and

individual character of a whole people. To be effective for good this public opinion must be intelligent, fearless and free. And this honest, robust, wholesome public opinion can only grow in an atmosphere of liberty and perfect freedom. The minds of men must be absolutely free to accept truth and defend it without the possibility of coercion or persecution.

The duty of every educated man then is simply this: to discover the truth and by every means consistent with the doctrine of liberty to make the truth prevail. The disclosure of truth and the embodiment of it in the life of men and in the shaping of institutions is the record and formula of civilization everywhere. This discovery and practical application of truth has been distressingly slow, and the gradual ascent of man has been a perpetual travail. In a sense each generation, and for that matter, each man must discover the truth for himself. Truth in itself is an entity. Yet we can only know it in its applications; that is, as we ourselves are related to it. It cannot therefore be passed along like some valuable commodity from individual to individual and from generation to generation. It only breaks through the clouds of surrounding darkness as individuals from age to age have the vision to see it and the altruism that makes them proclaim it to others.

This discovered truth, in another view of it, may be regarded as a seed. Plant it in the minds of men, it germinates, grows, bears fruit, some thirtyfold and some an hundredfold. The man who has long views, who discovers truth, who will plant it, and patiently wait for the harvest, is the wise man: and happy is the age or nation that has such men; for, as the Hebrew proverb puts it, where there is no vision the people perish.

This projection of the individual into society can only be done through ideas and never through force. This does not imply that we are not to combat error. We are to resist evil to the utmost of our ability, but let us make the effort in ways that will do permanent good. We cannot force men to accept our view or to be what we think they ought to be; we must convince and persuade them. It is allowable to smash error in every way that does no violence to the doctrine of liberty. This requires the more patience because liberty is, as we all know, everywhere abused. But after all, the world will, on the whole, gain by

liberty, for without it virtue could not exist. It ought forever to be insisted, however, that true liberty implies wisdom and justice.

This patient waiting for the harvest often calls upon us to allow the wheat and tares to grow together, it is in a sense a toleration of evil. But there is no utility of error. All truth is wholesome, all falsehood is hurtful. It is never right to do evil that good may come of it. While error then must never be accepted as good, yet it may be and often is necessary to wait to strike it down, and we must be careful not to do good in a way that evil will come of it. I raise the question, why is it that a religious age is always followed by irreligion, a generation of inspired and imaginative poets by an age of prose and reason, an era of prosperity by depression? Is not this ebb and flow in human history, that every student has remarked, due to the tyranny of the majority, to the tendency at these flood tide periods for the men and styles that dominate the epoch to force everything their way and to whip all recalcitrants into line, with a consequent reaction in the opposite direction? Is not human nature so constituted that the tyranny of the majority will always lead to reaction or to revolution? And is it not true that all reforms promoted by force and not by ideas have done far more harm than good? If the answer to these questions that I get from a study of history be correct, then it is always foolish and wicked to attempt to run rough shod over the judgment or to bully the moral sense of men. For good people, in all ages, this seems to have been and still seems to be the hardest lesson to learn; and especially is it hard for a gentle and generous people like the people of the South, who live by fine and disinterested sentiments, rather than by shrewd considerations of forethought and self-advancement. But Southern history, one would think, should have taught us at least this never-to-be-forgotten lesson. The mighty builders and founders of this republic were largely Southern men, and for generations the South furnished more than her share of leaders in every line of effort. But as time went on and as Southern men gave their minds more and more to the defense of their peculiar civil and political order of things, as their thinking became solidified and forced to move in fixed grooves, the conditions of our civilization at length ceased to

produce the great minds of the earlier period. We were set upon this hard road by uncontrollable circumstances, and we finally ran in a superb and awful way upon the sudden and sharp disaster of civil war. This solid crystallization and consequent stagnation of public opinion has been one of the persistent evils of slavery. And we still need to give a kindlier and freer hearing to all schools of thinking and a more patient consideration to minority opinion.

We not only need this open, rational, dispassionate discussion of political questions; but we need the same attitude of mind towards all questions of debate, however acute or vital they may seem to us to be. Any sort of constraint of opinion, whether it be tacit or overt, breeds an unhealthy intellectual atmosphere; and a sound and wholesome citizenship cannot be built up in miasmatic intellectual regions. As educated men we have the precious privilege of engaging in the age-long task of purifying the air and creating a better social, civic, and political climate of opinion.

Most of these duties are performed by the educated man in the very process of making all he can of himself. This complete development of oneself is a direct contribution to society, and the indirect influence from example of a successful man is above all the precepts of the unsuccessful and ineffectual. But there are at least two things that educated men should seek to promote among the people at large.

America's chief contributions to civilization have been in the production of wealth and physical well-being, and the wide dissemination of these among the great masses of men. Here lie the two glories and the two dangers of American civilization. To have added enormously to the wealth of the world and to have given all men the chance to work and live, provided only that nature has sufficiently endowed them with strength and energy to enter into their political rights and to use their opportunities for uplifting themselves, must stand as a memorable addition to the forces that make up modern life. But this swift and startling increase in wealth has led to materialism and this industrial and political democracy has augmented the possibilities and dangers of the crowd. To teach the age the uses of wealth and to cure

the permeating evils of an untrained democracy, is the call of America today to her educated men.

It is not an easy task to teach the right uses of wealth to a country engrossed in material tasks and dominated too largely by material ideals. Educated men by example and precept ought to teach those who have wealth that wealth carries obligations of service to the community, that it is a talent to be used for the widest good; that wealth is not a good in itself, not an end to be sought for its own sake, not to be selfishly hoarded or enjoyed, but to be used; not to be made the supreme aim, but to be properly subordinated to the higher uses of life.

The evils of the mob—of an ignorant, undisciplined, and therefore vicious democracy—are imminent and threatening. But the road this country must travel will surely lead to more rather than to less of popular liberty, and the unwholesome restiveness of the present can only be permanently cured by the fitting of the masses of men for enlightened self-government and by removing in right and fair ways whatever of abuses may exist in the business, social, and political life of the American people. This is a stupendous task—to school the mob in a democracy which is itself the government and which can only be lured and led, and cannot be controlled by the wise and patriotic men who are able to see the true ends of national existence and can discern the ways that lead to national and individual greatness; to develop the masses, to make them strong enough to maintain their rights against obnoxious wealth and desperate poverty, and at the same time reasonable enough to give perfect respect to the rights of others, even those better off than themselves; to make men too intelligent to be led by designing demagogues; in short to construct out of American citizens themselves a mighty tower of strength against blind ignorance as well as against sordid materialism—this is the stupendous task set before educated men in this democracy.

Be it always remembered that wealth is power, though it may be sometimes misused, and in the end wealth will make for a higher civilization; that democracy is the goal of humanity, though it is as yet stuck through and through with permeating evils, and democracy will finally achieve the greatest good to the greatest number.

Emerson said, "We judge of a man's wisdom by his hope." In this democracy we often need to be reassured by the hopefulness of the wise; for our national life at times looks like a seething caldron, to pessimistic minds even like a veritable slough of despond. The final duty of educated men, especially of educated young men, is to bring hope and forward-looking thoughts. I have read that on the coins of old Spain there was a device in which the shield of Castile and Leon was supported by the pillars of Hercules, which marked the limit of the Old World. But the motto spoke of no limit. "Plus Ultra," it ran—there is more beyond, and what that more might be no man could know. So forth men went in search of El Dorado and of the fountains of eternal youth; and they found America. "Plus Ultra" seems the best motto for America at the opening of the twentieth century (as may it be a fitting motto for each succeeding century)! There is on every hand manifest a spirit of unrest, but withal in the main a spirit of hopefulness. In business, government, religion, education, and society there is a widespread feeling that we stand at the very threshold of a new era. What is just ahead of us no man can know. But if enough enlightened and high-minded youth can be sent forth with courage and hope to go beyond the limits of past experience in search of a new El Dorado, we may expect, not in some far western island but here in our own time and country, to find a greater America.

## Modern Views of the Bible and of Religion

BY LUCIUS HOPKINS MILLER

Associate Professor of Biblical Instruction in Princeton University

That there is a modern point of view is denied by no one, if put as a general proposition, but it is denied by many when applied to the Bible and to religion. In what does this modern point of view consist and what has caused it? It consists in a new conception of man's powers and ways of acquiring knowledge, due to the advance in philosophy and psychology; in a new conception of the universe, due to science; and in enhanced recognition of man's social nature and obligations, due to a variety of causes, of which intercommunication and education are perhaps chief. According to the modern view, no cause is merely a cause. It is also an effect. This is true pre-eminently of the social organism. Instead of clearly-defined causes producing clearly-defined effects we have a network of interactive influences, well nigh impossible to separate, the sum total of which makes up our modern life.

\* \* \* \* \*

Philosophers\* differ still in their ultimate theories and they always will, but this does not mean that the "Queen of the Sciences" has not advanced. Since Kant, philosophers have been obliged to take up the question how we know before asking what we know. The answer has been what the plain man knew all along, that we learn only by experience. The ancient philosophers took a short cut, and reached reality by "jumping out of their skin," as the Germans say, but the modern philosopher is shut up to the slow, painful method of acquiring an ever larger experience of the facts of life, and thence by fair inference to his theories, and by logical deduction to the application of his theories, which must always ultimately be tested by the facts again. The effect of this change is evident. All our knowledge is relative and the absolute is a dim goal of greatness to strive for, but is not for man to compass, whether by philosophic theory, scientific formula, or theological creed. "We know in part." We are "mero-gnostics," as Dr. McCosh said, not agnostic or gnostic.

---

\*Weber, "Hist. of Phil.," §71.

Some think that all this is inapplicable to our knowledge of God and think they can put God into their pocket with their printed creed. These confound the religious instinct with that ever-increasing religious knowledge which the religious instinct plus experience is able to give. Others are content with the pleasing elevation of spirit produced by the religious sense in acts of worship, and consider that in this *feeling* is their knowledge of God. Not to underestimate the great fact of religious communion, it is at once clear that such feeling, apart from intellectual content, is empty. This is mysticism, not religious knowledge. Still others feel that truth is too much for our human limitations. We cannot know God. We cannot know anything certainly. They are agnostic. It is hard to prove the error of this position, for that we can know reality is the fundamental assumption of all our thought and activity, and this is perhaps the best answer to render. However, a thorough-going agnostic—one who holds that we can never know reality—should, in all conscience, stop thinking and acting; and, as a matter of fact, he does tend in that direction. At any rate, he is admittedly sailing "a blind course." He is "under sealed orders."

The "mero-gnostic" believes that he knows, but admits that he does not know all. He believes that God is being progressively revealed in the life of the world, and has been progressively revealed in the past. The Christian "mero-gnostic" is one who believes that through Jesus Christ we may attain, finally, unto perfect knowledge of God. He has a very reasonable basis in fact for his conviction, that the Christian revelation of God is the best that has been, and on that basis he may progress to the further faith, that it is the best that will be, i. e., that it is the final truth. For the full confirmation of that faith he must look to the future, for knowledge rests on experience, and the experience of the race is still in the making.

Though granting to all religions their share of truth, the Christian has ample ground for believing that, in Christianity, human experience has reached the highest point in its apprehension of God's nature, of His relation to man, and of the consequent relation of man to his fellow man. Thus the documents relating to the ancestry, birth and early years of that supreme religion will have for him a supreme place, the Old Testament, by its



indirect but organic connection, the New Testament, by its direct and necessary connection. Is the Bible inspired? Is it the revealed Word of God? Is it authoritative and infallible? The Bible revolves around the life of Jesus. Was the Spirit of God in Him? Does knowledge of God come through Him? Have His words and life authority? Does following Him infallibly bring an abundant life here and hope for the hereafter? Just in so far as we can answer these questions affirmatively, just so far may we make similar affirmations about the Bible as well, not undiscriminatingly, of course, but viewing it in the large. There are legends in the Bible and there are mistakes in the Bible. The Old Testament conception of God is imperfect in many respects, and some of Paul's interpretations of Christianity have little value for us today, but the Bible gives us certain historic knowledge of Jesus Christ, and with His life as a norm, every part falls into its proper place, and round Him as a center the Bible shapes itself as an organic whole. For the Christian, the Old Testament and the Epistles of Paul will be "inspired," "revealed," and "authoritative" just in so far as they are in harmony with the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. The knowledge of God traceable in the Old Testament was progressive, that is, from lower to higher, and Paul was "not as if he had already attained." We must employ historical criticism to find out the facts and then bring the facts to our Christian standard for a final estimate.

\* \* \* \* \*

But there has been another force working along similar lines in these latter days. Science has created an entirely new universe for us.\* We are living in a different world from that inhabited by our grandfathers. Evolution has raised anew, and in different form, the questions of the ultimate whence and whither. The new astronomy and the new biology have made the universe so big that man has trembled for his age-long importance. The new physics and chemistry have made him fear for his very soul's existence. The new scientific method, based on the uniformity and the universality of natural law, has made him wonder how and where God and religion come in. It is not within the scope of this article to discuss these questions except to point out two

---

\*Duncan, "The New Knowledge." Pritchett, "Science" (1857-1907), in *Atlantic Monthly*, Nov., 1907.

or three ways in which these changed conditions affect our view of the Bible and of religion.

Our proofs of God and of Christianity have changed. Proof rests on facts, together with an accepted interpretation of those facts. Modern science has enlarged our knowledge of facts and has changed their interpretation. Hence proofs have changed and they must continue to change with every change of thought.\* The proofs for the existence of God with which we are all familiar, if we are familiar with any, are those of the scholastic theologians of the middle ages, and commonly called the cosmological, the teleological and the moral arguments. These three arguments still have weight with many people in their original form, but only because there are many who do not realize the changes that have taken place. For the educated modern man they must be reinterpreted or discarded.

The cosmological argument is that which argues from the universe as an effect to God as the great first cause, outside of and before the world. As the watch cannot be thought of apart from the watchmaker, so cannot the universe be conceived apart from its maker. But the new conception of cause and effect knows no such relationship. "The cause is not before the effect and external to it, but simultaneous with it, and jointly concerned in it, at once cause and effect, acting and acted upon. . . . Thus, instead of a first mover, or great first cause, we get an ever present power in everything, and without a time relationship."† But what is this "ever present power?" It is interesting to note the recent tendency in science toward idealism. Philosophic scientists are recognizing that the "laws of external nature" are really formulations made by the human mind itself for its own convenience, and while it is assumed that nature herself corresponds to these formulations, still it is recognized that the scientific interpretation of the universe is a thing of the mind. The modern religious man may find in this, not the old cosmological proof of God, but certainly a most solid scientific basis for his belief in the supremacy of mind in the universe. The power which rules the world is not material.

This conclusion is a great gain, but it is far from being all we

---

\*Knox, "The Direct and Fundamental Proofs of the Christian Religion."

†Knox, *supra* (p. 17, 18). J. S. Mill, "Logic." Chap. on "Causation."

need. Is this mind active? Is there purpose back of it? Is the universe drifting, or is it being directed toward an end? The 18th century apologists answered these questions by means of the so-called "teleological argument," or the "argument from design." Paley's famous "eye illustration" was used to support the contention that there is design in the universe and that therefore there must have been a designer. The intricate arrangements of the eye, so beautifully adapted to all of its uses, conclusively proved that it had been designed for these very purposes. But Darwin's theory of adaptation to environment brought a new era, and when it was seen that the eye had not been designed beforehand to meet the demands of its future environment, but had been developed in all its powers by that environment itself, the discussion entered on a new phase. Is the teleological argument, however, entirely outworn? Can we not argue in any way from design in nature to a great designer? Certainly, in its classic form, the argument must be discarded, but interestingly enough, modern science here also is giving us proof of a great designer. We have clear reasons for believing that the mind of the universe is active, and that the universe is not a derelict, but is "making a port." In Hæckel's "Riddle of the Universe," we find the assertion made "that there is nothing in the universe besides matter and force, which that author calls, in combination, the 'One Substance' of his materialistic monism. But he, as well as his followers, never attempts to tell us *how* physical forces can work out complicated structures without any guidance of any sort. . . . There is something else which cannot be explained, i. e., by purely physical force, and that is directivity. . . . The origin of the cell's power, not only of reproducing a cell like itself, but of changing the form according to the requirement, has no parallel in the inorganic world or in the manufactories of man. Directivity is behind this cell power. . . . What caused ether to give rise to matter, whether by vortex rings . . . or other forces of some kind which must have been at work? What set force or forces going? Whence their directivity?"\* The facts of science give the ordinary man a reasonable basis for believing that there is a purposeful mind in the universe.

But even this will help us little, or not at all, unless we can

---

\*G. Henslow, "Directivity," *Hilbert Journal*, Oct., 1907.

know what the purpose of this mind is. Is the purpose a good one or a bad one? The "moral argument" was adduced to answer this question. There is evident goodness in the world, hence the purpose that controls it is good. The manifest "*petitio principii*" here was closely seen by James Mill, who was so oppressed by the many signs of evil in the world that he came to the conclusion that either there was no God at all, or that he was a God of evil purpose. Here the individual must find for himself in the experiences of his own life and in the course of history, which includes pre-eminently the life of Christ and the history of Christianity, the basis for his belief in the goodness of the purpose underlying the world's progress. The Christian holds love to be the "*summum bonum*" and he will find in God, the Loving Father, as manifested in the life of Jesus Christ the mind, will and heart of the universe, which science herself is aiding him to understand and to believe in.

But modern science has produced another great change in religious apologetics. Until comparatively recent times, the miracles of Christ were considered the proof of the truth of the Christian religion. It is a notable fact that today it is harder to convince an unbeliever of the truth of the miracles than it is to convince him of the truth of the religion the miracles are supposed to prove. Whatever we may think of miracles, it is plain that their force as primary proof is largely gone, whatever supplementary proof they may still possess. Christianity is to be "proved" if at all, by the life of Christ as shown in His words, acts, purpose and influence, apart from miracles. Men accept miracles, if at all, because they accept Christ, and not Christ because of the miracles. Such extraordinary acts of Jesus as are so probable, historically, as to be practically certain, are not to be interpreted as "violations of nature," for nature cannot be "violated," since she is not merely "physical nature," but includes all forces and laws, spiritual as well as material. Miracle, in this sense, modern science denies. The essence of miracle, if we wish to keep the term at all, consists in the presence and activity in the realm of the material of the Great Spirit whom we call God. To this presence and activity science has no objection to offer, but rather the contrary, as has already been indicated. The unusual acts of Jesus above referred to, are to be understood

as manifestations of the power of this spirit over matter, and as such they may enrich our conception of the character of Christ, which is the central, essential fact of Christianity, on which all valid apologetics must be based.

The determination of the question, which of the miraculous stories of the gospels are, and which are not, historically probable, presupposes the work of historical criticism—one of the most important results of the modern scientific movement in its bearing on the Bible. The scientific method means the thorough collation of facts, the formulation of working theories on the basis of those facts, and, finally, the testing of the theories again by the facts. It was inevitable that this method should early be applied to the investigation of the past, and that the interest and the value of knowing certainly what had happened, should foster the rise of what is called modern historical criticism. It was inevitable, also, owing to the wide spread of religious, as well as historical, interest, that this criticism should soon be applied to the Bible. That some of its exponents have applied this method in too narrow and theoretic a fashion, and others in an irreverent spirit, should not blind our eyes to the fact that it is the only method possible, if we really wish to know what actually has happened. That, too often, the nature of our sources of information forbid reaching as positive conclusions as we should like, is a fact to be deplored, but not ignored. The nature of the subject demands, and usually obtains, reverent treatment, but does not therefore free the student from the absolute necessity of impartial and thorough examination of the facts, and of unbiased inference from these facts.

Historical and literary criticism have proved, to the satisfaction of a large and increasing number of students, that the books of the Bible are not, and in almost every case, were not intended to be scientific history. They could not be, for scientific history was, in those times, an unknown thing. They are to be regarded rather as historical documents, to be used with discrimination, according to their varying value, for they do vary in value, thus serving as means of reconstructing the actual history. It is needless to say that in one way or another, they are all documents of very high historical value, some more, some less, and that from them can be secured a sufficiently clear and reliable

account of the Hebrew people and their religion,\* of the life of Christ,† and of the early years of the Christian religion.‡ However, large readjustments of view are necessary. It is indubitable that the Hebrews shared in the primitive legends of all the peoples of Southwestern Asia, though the early chapters of Genesis breathe the high religious atmosphere of the late Hebrew writers who shaped them, and thus are greatly superior to their Babylonian counterparts. The "law" of the Hebrews, like all law, came in increasingly complex codes as the nation advanced, and registered, as always, the underlying life of the people.§ The prophets take their proper place as the men through whom the Hebrew nation, in the fulness of its life, rose to its highest thought of God and of man in their various relations, forming a royal line of religious leaders that was to culminate in Jesus Christ.|| The Psalms become the hymn book of a nation instead of expressing merely the aspirations of an individual, and the Proverbs a collection out of many times, and from many men, of that sententious wisdom of which the Oriental is so enamoured—both books gaining thereby in historic, and losing no religious value.¶ The whole Old Testament becomes dynamic instead of static, and the development thus portrayed enhances, rather than diminishes, the belief in the guiding hand of God. In the New Testament, while it is increasingly evident that we must depend almost entirely upon the synoptic gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke, for our information concerning the life of Christ,° and that even in them discrimination must be employed in order to separate the assured fact from the probable, the merely possible and the improbable, still it is beyond dispute that the strictest historical criticism gives us, from the gospels, an historic picture of the founder of our religion, sufficiently clear to enable us to know Him, and on the basis of that indubitable knowledge to test the faith for which we may contend in the manner already indicated.

Thus it is that historical criticism (the "higher criticism" so

\*Kent, "History of the Hebrew People."

†Rhees, "Life of Jesus of Nazareth." Sandys, "Life of Christ." Holtzman "Life of Jesus."

‡McGiffert, "Apostolic Age."

§Hasting's Bible Dictionary, Art. "Hexateuch."

||W. R. Smith, "Prophets of Israel." Cornill, "Prophets of Israel."

¶Driver, "Introduction to the Old Testament."

°Bacon, "New Testament Introduction."

often inveighed against), the child of the modern scientific movement, obliges us to shift our landmarks somewhat, but leaves us still the land, and in fact, by a more accurate survey, has made us feel "surer of our ground." As in the far West, where the early government surveys were very carelessly and incorrectly made, the changes of land titles, due to the later and more accurate surveys, produced disturbance and some alarm, so is it with the more accurate historical study of the Bible. But no one contends that the government should allow the earlier surveys to remain unchallenged and uncorrected. We see, therefore, that modern science, far from being the antagonist of religious faith, is really its handmaid, as it ought to be, if God is one and truth is one. The conflict has been, and is, between science and dogmatic theology, not between science and religion.\*

\* \* \* \* \*

The last element of the modern point of view to be considered is that of an enhanced social consciousness. Perhaps the most striking feature of our modern life is the rapid and world-wide tendency toward democracy. It is not the aim here to discuss the nature or the causes of this universal phenomenon, but merely to indicate its effect upon views of religion and of the Bible. The religion of the pre-exilic Hebrews was social and political in its bearings, a community, rather than an individual, religion. The exilic and post-exilic experiences of the people gave rise to that religious individualism which has been in the ascendant in the Christian line of development ever since. Christianity has been interpreted as a matter between the individual and his God. It has been his own soul's salvation and the favor of God for himself first, that have largely absorbed the Christian's thought, and this is still the ruling method of interpreting Christianity outside of the great centers of human life where social questions are paramount. Alongside of this individualistic Christianity has grown up a new social consciousness, and a deeper sense of social responsibility that demand a larger view of God and of salvation. Many, failing to find this larger view in the minds of the accepted interpreters of the gospel, conclude that the gospel does not cover the present situation, that it is outworn, and is to be discarded with the Bible, which is the means of propagating it. Others,

---

\*White, "Warfare of Science and Theology." Introduction.

suspecting that there may be a truer interpretation not commonly given, examine the gospels and proclaim Jesus as the first, the great socialist. However these things may be, Christianity has to meet not only the questions of modern science, but even more the questions of the modern industrial worker and tenement house dweller. Has Christianity the best message still for the man submerged by modern social and industrial conditions? Has it any message at all? If it has not, it is doomed and with it the Bible will soon practically disappear.\*

Using the terms in their ordinary sense, Jesus was neither a socialist nor an individualist, for he was not concerned with theories of property or of government, and it is perfectly true that, were all men wholly Christian, socialism and individualism would work equally well.

Jesus' promulgation of the Kingdom of God, a community which is to include all men who will consider themselves children of the Father, and brothers to their fellows, combines perfectly both the individual and the social elements necessary to meet the demands of the hour, and in the extension of that kingdom lies the hope of our modern life. Those who still linger in the outworn individualism of the middle ages and early protestantism, need to note the social needs right about them. No individualistic gospel will meet those needs, and if the real gospel is not something more, it must go. Those who see in Jesus merely a socialistic reformer, and those who find in Him no message at all for our modern social life, alike base their conclusions on either a prejudiced or a careless examination of His life and teachings. "It is not only that the gospel preaches solidarity and the helping of others; it is in this message that its real import consists. In this sense it is profoundly socialistic, just as it is also profoundly individualistic, because it establishes the infinite and independent value of every human soul. . . . As has been truly said, its object is to transform the socialism, which rests on the basis of conflicting interests into the socialism which rests on the consciousness of a spiritual unity."† Modern historical criticism has set Jesus forth clearly, as He really was,

\*Jenks, "The Social Teachings of Jesus." Rauschenbusch, "Christianity and the Social Crisis." Peabody, "Jesus Christ and the Social Question."

†Harnack, "What Is Christianity?" Chap. 6.



not only as the ideal for the individual in his relation to God and to his fellowmen, but also as the founder of a great community of brotherly-minded individuals—a community with whose advance are bound up the highest interests of that great world community with which it is some day to become identical. In Jesus, the individual, therefore, we may find the way not merely to the salvation of all individuals, but also to the salvation of society as a whole—the great end so ardently sought by all men alive to modern social conditions, but so grossly ignored by many Christians. With increasing confidence in Christianity as the only means to this end, will come an increasing confidence in the book of Christianity, signs of which are already seen in a renewed study of its social teachings and an increasing emphasis on its social message.

\* \* \* \* \*

Changes in philosophic thought, advances in scientific discovery and reorganization of the social life of man will continue to come as the world grows older. As they come, the new light they shed upon the problems of life and of destiny will modify men's views of God, of man, of Jesus Christ and of the Bible, but let us rest secure in the assurance that, as in the past, so in the future, our Christian faith will be increasingly clarified and increasingly justified.

## The Passing of Two Great Americans

By EDWIN MIMS

Professor of English Literature in Trinity College

The death of Grover Cleveland is now too far removed in point of time to call for any extended comment in this magazine. The details of his remarkable career are so fresh in the minds of the readers of papers and magazines as to need no summary here. But there are certain traits of his character, certain important contributions that he made to the permanent life of the nation that need to be emphasized repeatedly; and especially there are certain points in his relation to the Southern people that have not perhaps received adequate attention.

There is practical unanimity of opinion as to the definite contributions that he made to American history. At a time when politicians of both parties were merely playing with the question of civil service reform, he committed his administration to the policy of the merit system in the appointment of subordinate officers. Necessarily he made mistakes in the enforcement of the reform and was consequently criticised by some of the more ardent reformers; but to him and President Roosevelt must be accredited the largest share in the establishment of the idea and the definite working out of the system. When he began his first term in 1885 only 13,000 out of 130,000 appointments were in the classified service list. At the end of his second term in 1896, there were 96,000.

His services in behalf of tariff reform were not less significant. When the country finally takes up in earnest this most pressing of all American problems, the famous single-topic message of 1887 will perhaps be considered the most inspiring trumpet-note in the long warfare against the evils of the protective system. Only the treachery of some of the leaders of the Democratic party in 1893 prevented a really constructive program of tariff reform. Despite the fact that Mr. Cleveland was defeated in what was perhaps the most ardent hope of his life, he will have a high place among American statesmen for his steadfast effort to arouse the people to a sense of the injustice and even corruption of a high protective tariff.

Too much credit cannot be given him for his resistance to the silver craze that swept over the country in the early nineties. The men of both parties were inclined to yield to the clamor and passion of the multitude; but coming to a conclusion on the matter from his own study and from talks with experts, Mr. Cleveland was unyielding in his opposition. It was not only a financial question, but a moral one as well. When a mass meeting was held at Cooper Union at a time when he was being considered as a prospective candidate for president in 1892, he wrote a letter stating his position in unequivocal terms. To some of his friends who urged him not to send the letter he said with characteristic courage: "I am a citizen of New York State and New York City, and should take the part of a citizen in any important question. There is to be a public meeting of citizens held this evening to express opinions on a question which to my mind is of the utmost importance. You say that by expressing my opinion on the subject I might embarrass my friends. I am going to write a letter and send it to that meeting, and the presidency can go." When he became president the pressure upon him by his party was very great, but he stood firm in the maintenance of his position that is now universally conceded to have been the right one. But for his firm stand, irretrievable damage would have been done the national honor and integrity. The same firm resolution was seen in his resistance to the Chicago mob, when he used the Federal army to quell a disturbance that might have become national in its scope.

In all of these questions his strongest trait was a masterful and unshaken courage, "the virtue which gives security to all the other virtues." When his mind and heart became convinced of the righteousness of an action it was his glory never to submit or yield. He was literally a tower of strength that stood foursquare to all the winds that blow. He was therefore one of the shining examples in American history of patriotism that cared more for the people than for their approval. Few men have ever had the courage to deal with the pension system. In spite of all possible misrepresentation he persisted in studying each case on its own merits. When the American people shall have had the courage to consider the enormous abuses that have grown up around this system his words may be quoted as the signal for

attack: "The evil threatened by this bill is in my opinion such that, charged with a great responsibility in behalf of the people, I cannot do otherwise than to bring to the consideration of this measure my best efforts of thought and judgment and perform my constitutional duty in relation thereto, regardless of all consequences, except such as appear to me to be related to the best and highest interests of the country."

Undoubtedly the general trend of his work was negative rather than constructive; but at that particular time in American history the power to resist was the great quality needed in a national leader. He was not a great party leader; it was partly due to this temperamental defect that he was left without a party in his last administration. He was in striking contrast with President McKinley in this respect. Of all recent leaders he was most like Governor Hughes. There are times when compromise will not do, when the only course open to the servant of the people is to resist the voices of party expediency. Grover Cleveland had an elemental honesty that was frequently disassociated from tact. With all that may be credited to recent men who have made war upon political bosses—municipal, State, and national—it must not be forgotten that Grover Cleveland was the first man to make such a warfare possible, the first to appeal directly to the people in behalf of political honesty and justice. His victory at Chicago in 1892—over the protest of the politicians of his own State and disappointed bosses in every State—is one of the most thrilling chapters in the history of political parties.

Such leadership gave rise to the most important political movement in recent American history. He made possible the independent voter at a time when the Republican party had an almost undisputed hold on the better classes of the Northern people, when every sort of appeal was made for party regularity, when it required courage on the part of any prominent man to break the ties that bound him to his party. Mr. Cleveland by his courage, his advocacy of important reforms and his thorough-going honesty of purpose gave the better class of men a chance to express their convictions. Thousands of men in New York in 1884 followed the leadership of George William Curtis in his refusal to support Blaine, a notorious spoilsman and partisan. Such men felt that the Democratic party under the leadership of

Cleveland was far more "respectable" than it had ever been; and in spite of the waving of the bloody shirt and the appeal to dead issues, they recorded their protest through the ballot. Ridiculed for a long time as mugwumps, the independents have in the process of time come to be recognized as the men who hold the balance of power in the pivotal States of the Union. There were 2,000,000 of them in the last Presidential election—men who voted with one party on local issues and with the other on national. Among all the forces that have made such a result possible, the temperament and leadership of Cleveland must be considered one of the most potent. In 1896 he himself became an Independent Democrat who refused to follow his party.

Especially did Mr. Cleveland appeal to the university men of his day. It was a notable fact that the faculty of Harvard University almost to a man supported him in his advocacy of tariff reform, that such men as Benjamin Ide Wheeler, now president of the University of California, took the stump for him in New York State, and that the *Nation*—at that time more than now the organ of the academic people of the country—supported him with unusual fervor. A striking illustration of the esteem in which he was held by university men was Harvard's conferring the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws on him in 1886—the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the university. Lowell's admirable address on the occasion reached its climax in his tribute to the distinguished guest—words far removed from any conventional tribute: "The sons of Harvard all belong to the party which admires courage, strength of purpose, and fidelity to duty. He has left the helm of State to be with us here, and so long as it is intrusted to his hands, we are sure that, should the storm come, he will say with Seneca's Pilot: 'O, Neptune, you may save me if you will; you may sink me if you will; but whatever happens, I shall keep my rudder true.'"

Two years later, in an address on Tariff Reform, just after Cleveland's stirring message, Lowell spoke of him as "the best representative of the higher type of Americanism that we have seen since Lincoln was snatched from us. . . . The President's chair has a *Man* in it, and this means that every word he says is weighted with what he is." How younger Harvard men—students and instructors—felt is feelingly expressed in a poem written by

Mr. William Garrott Brown just after Mr. Cleveland's death. He is recalling "the stirring memories of a courage and sincerity that did not count the cost of doing the right and speaking the truth"—

"This deep remembrance of old ardors true—  
Dear as youth—in us, who at his call,  
Bared stripling arms plain patient work to do."

It was not strange, therefore, that when President Cleveland retired from the presidency he should have selected a university town as his home in which to spend the remainder of his days. He was not a college man himself, but unlike many self-educated men, he had learned to put the proper estimate upon university work. His life at Princeton was all that he might have anticipated in his fondest dreams. He became a trustee of the institution, an intimate friend of members of the faculty, and the idol of the student body. President Roosevelt was not more loyal to Harvard or Mr. Taft to Yale than was Mr. Cleveland to Princeton. As his friend, Dr. Henry van Dyke says: "In the affairs of Princeton University, he rendered an invaluable service. . . . He seemed to have the 'Princeton spirit' by instinct. As a trustee he brought to the council of the University a straightforward, common-sense; a knowledge of human nature and practical affairs. . . . This made him a tower of strength; and the loss of his unceasing counsel, always sane and candid and loyal, going directly to the main point at issue, refreshing and invigorating as a breath of pure air, will be deeply felt by every Princeton man."

On the occasion of the Princeton Sesqui-centennial in 1896, Mr. Cleveland made an address on the "Influence of Universities," which must be considered one of his most important utterances, and one of the best statements ever made of the relation of higher education to a democracy—a platform on which all colleges might stand. Some quotations are most timely both in view of his death and in connection with a presidential campaign now in progress:

"A collegiate training, the study of principles unvexed by distracting and misleading influences, and a correct apprehension of the theories upon which our Republic is established, ought to constitute the college graduate a constant monitor, warning against popular rashness and excess. . . . A constant stream of thoughtful, educated men should come from our universities and colleges preaching national honor and

integrity, and teaching that a belief in a necessity of national obedience to the laws of God is not born of superstition. . . .

"When the excitement of party warfare passes dangerously near our safeguards, I would have the intelligent conservatism of our universities and colleges warn the contestants in impressive tones against the perils of a breach impossible to repair.

"When popular discontent and passion are stimulated by the arts of designing partisans to a pitch perilously near to class hatred or sectional anger, I would have our universities and colleges sound the alarm in the name of American brotherhood and fraternal dependence.

"When the attempt is made to delude the people into the belief that their suffrages can change the operation of natural laws, I would have our universities and colleges proclaim that those laws are inexorable and far removed from political control.

"When selfish interest seeks undue private benefit through governmental aid, and public places are claimed as rewards of party service, I would have our universities and colleges persuade the people to a relinquishment of the demand for party spoils and exhort them to a disinterested and patriotic love of their government for its own sake.

"When a design is apparent to lure the people from their honest thoughts and to blind their eyes to the sad plight of national dishonor and bad faith, I would have Princeton University, panoplied in her patriotic traditions and glorious memories, and joined by all the other universities and colleges of our land, cry out against the inflicting of this treacherous and fatal wound."

It is difficult to realize the great joy that the South had in Cleveland's selection in 1884. Not much was known about him personally, but the victory of the Democratic party was sufficient in itself to call forth unbounded enthusiasm. When Henry Grady, followed by an enthusiastic band of Atlanta citizens, marched into the Georgia legislature and announced, in imposing and exultant tones, that Cleveland had been elected president of the United States, and thereby declared the body adjourned to celebrate the victory, he was giving expression in a dramatic way to the joy of his section. Torch light processions, bonfires and brass bands were everywhere in evidence in Southern cities and villages. For the first time in a quarter of a century the Southern people felt that they were represented in the councils of the nation. And later, when President Cleveland appointed Southern men to his cabinet, the South felt that she had come back to the house of her fathers. In the face of much criticism by narrow Northerners, Cleveland continued throughout his administration his policy of doing all in his power to heal the nation's wounds.

His wisdom was fully justified when he revealed to the country such men as Lamar and Carlisle and William L. Wilson. In the campaign of 1892, and later in the great contest over tariff reform in Congress, Southern men bore a commanding part. Scarcely less admirable than the heroic efforts of the President himself was the leadership of William L. Wilson in the House of Representatives; especially when he stood one morning with bandaged eyes pleading with his party and patriots of the opposing party to put an end to the injustice and inequality of the tariff system. And be it said to the everlasting honor of Southern senators that none of them—unless indeed Senator Gorman be considered a Southerner—united with the coterie of Democratic senators who finally brought defeat to the Wilson Bill. In this fight Southerners might well have felt that they were harking back to the great ideas of Southern statesmen before the war and maintaining the traditional Southern attitude.

Suddenly, however, in Cleveland's second administration, the South ceased to follow the president, nay more, the section for which he had done more than any other public man since the Civil War misunderstood him, slandered him, vilified him. Partly by reason of his failure to dispense patronage in accordance with the demands of Southern representatives in Congress, but more particularly on account of his views on the free coinage of silver, and later on account of his issuance of bonds to meet a serious national crisis, he was hailed as a traitor to his party and his country. People did not stop with opposing him on these public questions; they even imputed to him unworthy motives and assailed his integrity. The men whom he had gathered about him in his cabinet or who identified themselves with his policies, were retired to private life; and the South went off into vagaries of political ideas from which she has not entirely recovered. All the extravagant praise that has been written about Mr. Cleveland since his death—some of it by men who formerly were foremost in their abuse of him—should not prevent us from seeing the tremendous harm that was done to this section by its fatal lack of insight, and, what is worse, its lack of charity and its intolerance. There is a lesson in this, a warning that we as a people cannot afford to miss. Now that we see him in his true light we



should impress upon ourselves the futility of blind clamor and offensive partisanship.

No man was more absolutely incorruptible. There have been greater presidents, but none with higher courage, or more unselfish devotion to the interests of his country.

The fact that Grover Cleveland and Joel Chandler Harris died within a week of each other is perhaps the only excuse for including them in the same article. Their lives did not touch each other; there were few if any points of resemblance in their characters or in their achievements. The only point of comparison is that they were both great Americans, national in their spirit. As has already been seen, Mr. Cleveland knew no sections, and one of his prime achievements was that he did so much to bring the two sections closer together. Mr. Harris was provincial in the better sense of that word, but not in the least sectional. He is a very large force in Southern literature, not because he deliberately set about writing distinctively Southern stories, but because he portrayed human nature in such a way as to make a universal appeal. In memorable words he said: "What does it matter whether I am Northerner or Southerner if I am true to truth, and true to that larger truth, my own true self? My idea is that truth is more important than sectionalism, and that literature that can be labeled Northern, Southern, Western or Eastern is not worth labeling at all." Again he said, speaking of the ideal Southern writer: "He must be Southern and yet cosmopolitan; he must be intensely local in feeling, but utterly unprejudiced and unpartisan as to opinions, tradition, and sentiment. Whenever we have a genuine Southern literature, it will be American and cosmopolitan as well. Only let it be the work of genius and it will take all sections by storm."

In the editorials that he wrote for the *Atlanta Constitution* and for *Uncle Remus' Magazine*, as well as in the shrewd and homely wisdom of Mr. Billy Sanders, of Shady Dale, he gave expression to the same national point of view that was so marked in the speeches and writings of his friend, Henry W. Grady. But it was not in these formal statements of his views that his greatest work lay—even in the direction of nationalism. It was as the creator

of imaginative literature that he served most effectively as the interpreter of his people to the American people and to the world. That reading and thinking people have learned to think differently of certain phases of life in the old South is due primarily, not to the logical discussions of the rights of secession, or to the oratory of Southern speakers and publicists, but to the homely wit and the elemental human nature everywhere evident in "Uncle Remus" and other Southern stories. His career and work are therefore a striking lesson to the South of the place of creative writing in the life of a people. Many people of the ante-bellum times made light of literature as a profession; they underrated its worth and value, except now and then when they became sensitive to the criticism made on the lack of literature, at which time they would make protestations in favor of mediocre writers or resolve in some way to manufacture a literature to order. Joel Chandler Harris was a real help to his section by writing simply and naturally of the life that passed away with the Civil War. He was as much surprised as anybody when fame came to him. He never took himself seriously as a literary man. "He did not look like one, did not talk or act like one, and, for that matter, always refused to consider himself as one." He once said: "People insist on considering me a literary man. I have no literary training and know nothing at all of what is termed literary art. I have had no opportunities to nourish any serious literary ambition."

Here, then, we have a repetition of that constant miracle of genius coming without observation. Mr. Harris wrote his first stories as space-fillers for the *Constitution*, and also for the pure fun of it. He portrayed the life which he had seen as an imaginative boy, told simple folk stories that were found to be akin to the universal stories of all races in their childhood. In his introduction to "Nights with Uncle Remus" he tells of the circumstances under which he secured additions to his own stock of stories. It is such a characteristic passage that I quote it at length—so full of the naturalness and simplicity of the man and such an illustration of the origin and appeal of pure art:

"One of these opportunities occurred in the summer of 1882, at Norcross, a little railroad station, twenty miles northeast of Atlanta. The writer was waiting to take the train to Atlanta, and this train, as it fortunately happened, was delayed. At the station were a number of

negroes, who had been engaged in working on the railroad. It was night, and, as there was nothing better to do, they were waiting to see the train go by. Some were sitting in little groups up and down the platform of the station and some were perched upon a pile of crossties. They seemed to be in great good humor, and cracked jokes at each other's expense, in the midst of boisterous shouts of laughter. The writer sat next to one of the liveliest talkers in the party; and after listening and laughing awhile, told the 'Tar Baby Story' by way of a feeler, the excuse being that someone in the crowd mentioned 'Ole Molly Har!' The story was told in a low tone as if to avoid attracting attention, but the comments of the negro, who was a little past middle age, were loud and frequent. 'Dar, now!' he would exclaim, or 'He's a honey mon!' or 'Gentermens, git out de way, an' gin 'im room!'

"These comments and the peals of unrestrained and unrestrained laughter that accompanied them, drew the attention of the other negroes, and before the climax of the story had been reached, where Brother Rabbit is cruelly thrown into the brier-patch, they had all gathered around and made themselves comfortable. Without waiting to see what the effect of the 'Tar Baby' legend would be, the writer told the story of 'Brother Rabbit and the Mosquitoes,' and this had the effect of convulsing them. Two or three could hardly wait for the conclusion, so anxious were they to tell stories of their own. The result was that, for almost two hours, a crowd of thirty or more Negroes vied with each other to see which could tell the most and the best stories. Some told them poorly, giving only meagre outlines, while others told them passing well; but one or two, if their language and their gestures could have been taken down, would have put Uncle Remus to shame. Some of the stories had already been gathered and verified, and a few had been printed in the first volume, but the great majority were either new or had been entirely forgotten."

In such a simple way, then, were his stories collected and told. Few men have ever so transferred to words the inimitable art of story-telling. Their effect on the negroes themselves suggests the story of Cooper's reading his first sea story to an old tar whose pleasure in it was the surest evidence of the novelist's success—far more trustworthy than the judgment of a professional critic. The "Uncle Remus" stories made their appeal not only to the uncultivated negroes, but to imaginative children and childlike men and women throughout the world. The author was more beloved in family circles than any other of his contemporaries. The esteem in which he was held throughout the United States was evidenced nowhere so much as when two of the greatest men of the nation, in their trips through the South and to Atlanta, insisted on the privilege of seeing the man who had

given so much pleasure to themselves and their children. No politician or business man or preacher in Atlanta could take the place in the minds of President Roosevelt and Mr. Carnegie that this simple and modest man had—one must needs have him in the place of honor at a banquet and later in the White House as his guest, the other visited him at Snap Bean Farm.

Many demands were made upon Mr. Harris by publishers and magazine editors. Besides the "Uncle Remus" stories he wrote the fascinating story of his life on the old plantation—one of the most interesting of autobiographies—; a series of legends for children whom the earlier stories had drawn around him; various short stories full of the realism and romance of the Georgia mountaineers; and one novel, "Gabriel Tolliver." Like most men of genius who strike a rich vein, he perhaps overworked it. Certainly in his novel and in some of his later stories there is a letting down of his imagination, a decline in his plastic power.

It remains true that his "Uncle Remus" stories constitute his chief fame and his surest chance for literary immortality. As an offset to the sentimental portrait of Uncle Tom or the absurd parody of the minstrel show, he is a realistic portrayer of the old-time negro. In contrast with the type of negro presented by Mr. Page, "Uncle Remus" is notable for the fact that, while he has his relations to white people—at once kindly and tender—he lives his own life and harks back to the traditions of his own race. In drawing the negro Mr. Harris has seen him from his own standpoint. There is in his stories the flavor of the old plantation, but echoes, too, of primeval jungles. No one has entered so sympathetically into the life of that race—his stories, by reason of their human sympathy, are in striking contrast with the cruder and more sensational stories of recent writers.

Of few men could it be said with such truth that the writer was the man. He had the childlike mind, shy, sensitive to the invisible things, unconventional. His attitude to animals and to flowers and trees reminds one of St. Francis. He was, as one who knew him well said of him recently, "familiar only among elemental things, wild to the conventionalities of the world—the brother of all men, the Homer of little children, the near kin of the creatures." That was a fine Christmas message he wrote to the children in his magazine last year: "He hopes

that the materialists will never be able to destroy in the minds of the children the budding faith in things unseen, the kindly belief in things beyond their knowledge; he hopes that Santa Claus will come often while they sleep, and that real fairies will dance in their innocent dreams." With the same childlike faith he said of Death: "I have always wanted to know what was on the other side." And now he does!

## Gullah: A Negro Patois

By JOHN BENNETT, ESQUIRE  
Of Charleston, South Carolina

There is a patois spoken in the mainland and island regions, bordering the South Atlantic Seaboard, so singular in its sound as constantly to be mistaken for a foreign language. It is found in no other portion of the South. Ordinary negro dialect found in books has no resemblance to it. It is found on the southeast coast alone. Its strange words, singular pronunciations, peculiar corruptions, and frequent abbreviations so disguise the familiar features of one's native tongue, while rhythmical modulations and unfamiliar accents, characteristic of some European languages, give it so un-English a sound that a stranger, upon first hearing, might, indeed frequently does, mistake it for some foreign tongue, an experience easily illustrated by an example:

One February morning, a little after dawn, I stood upon the Battery,\* watching the breaking fog drift out to sea. Standing near me, by the iron railing, was a gentleman; from his air of ingenuous interest, a stranger; from the sprackness, as the Scotch would say, of his clothes, a New Yorker. Faintly through the fog came the splashing rush of an approaching boat; a moving blur, a long boat from one of the islands, appeared through the mist; and with it a drifting refrain, in a shrill, falsetto voice:

"'Buh Rabbut, wuh yuh duh do dey?  
Grabble tettah fuh de nyoung gal;  
Tettah dutty muh fingah;  
Nyoung gal tek um fuh laff at!'"†

"'Eh! Eh! Hackless!‡ wuh yuh try fuh do? Shum de-dey? 'Tuz W'ite P'int! Enty yo' shum? 'Tuz de Bahtry! Ona ont gwine mek um! Dey 'tuz! Pul! mahn; pul! Now, tergarruh! Me 'clay!§ ona|| ent wut ona bittle! Now, tergarruh; pul! Wut time hit tez? Seb'm? Gord, mahn! dey yent time fuh jove¶

---

\*Charleston, South Carolina.

†Charleston oystermen's song.

‡Hercules.

§Declare.

||You, familiar address between equals; *ona, onna*; down the coast, *hoonah*.

¶Verbal use of "jove," adj., from "jovial, cheerful, gay;" sense, to joke, to indulge in easy pleasantry: "dem all berry lub Mass' Willy, eh bun so jove; 'im jove wid niggah all de time; an' wuk gone light wud jove." "Wud jove," with jesting.

now! Pul! senkah one jack nag! I golly! *ona ent wut!* . . . Den 'im holleh say: 'Who duh da' dey een yuh?' 'E yent yerry er soun'. Dat *too* droll; 'e yent know wuffeh do! Eh graff 'im ahx, an' 'e duh bus' de do' een, *br-r-ram, oh!* Ki! *ona ent yerre 'bout dat yut?* Me yiz yerry um buffo' day-clean soon er mo'nin'. 'Omans holléh loud senkah\* chahnticleeah! *Ona ent yerre 'bout um?* *Ona soon yerre 'bout um;* too soon yerre 'bout trouble! Trouble yuh; trouble dey; trouble ketch ebrywey: an' *ona ent yerre 'bout trouble?* *Ona soon yerre 'bout nutt'n but trouble.* . . . Senkah Buh Allegatuh, *ona ent see trouble 'twel de ma'sh bu'n;* an' 'yuh, trouble bun 'pon topper we senkah dut an' flea 'pon topper dorg! Yas, muh! *Enty, now?* Me, Ha'tym,† sho' gwine ketch jawb een rock-fiel‡ 'twul trouble duh wahnich erway fum 'pon topper Jeems I-lánt! *Enty, now?* Yas, muh!

"'An' a roly an' er hole een muh han', hebbenlye angel!

An' a roly een muh Jesus on!'"§

The blur grew faint in the mist; the rush of the boat died away; the shrill refrain came faintly across the water. The stranger turned, a bewildered expression on his face. "I beg your pardon!" he said. "But what language was that?"

"That wasn't a language," I replied. "It was only a remnant."

"A remnant? Of African?"

"No, sir; no bit of it; more Dorset and Devon; only common English. That, sir, is *Gullah*."

He knitted his brow, and in the language of all that is extraneous, turned to me and said: "I beg your pardon, sir! What did you say? *Gullah?*"

Again, to quote an example, of more bucolic style:

"In the cold gray of the early dawn there came a knocking at the cabin door: *bam! bam! bam!* A voice within said drowsily, in the accent of the night: '*Eh! eh! Timpan!*' *Enty yo' yudde de do' go br-r-ram?* *Wek up, mahn! Do erbout; anseh de do'!*'

"A shuffle of feet. A masculine voice speaking from within the almost hermetically sealed hovel, from whose wattle-and-daub

\*Like.

†Hard-times; a given name.

‡Phosphate rock-fields.

§The refrain of a "spiritual" song: "(I shall conquer Death). By this roll, and by the signature of the hole in my hand; and shall rest in my Jesus' arms."

chimney the delicate blue smoke straight toward the sky ascends, in a challenging tone took up the dialogue:

'Da' who?'

'Da' he.'

'Da' you?'

'Da' me.'

'Hoonah who?'

'Caesah Bee.'

'Fo' Gord, mahn! *who kya' ef yo' do see a bee?*'

'Me yunt say 'Me see a bee!' Me say, 'Me Caesah!' Hoonah yunt yudde me wud!'

The reply came sharply from the sleeping house:

'Wud walk fas' senkah done-tass' niggah; yez 'tan' 'till. Me no yudde. Enty yo' know me yiz duh sleep? Me no yudde yuh.'

'Hoonah wait, senkah dorg, fuh de las' ho'n-blow! Me yis hawleh too long!'

'Me no know hoonah dey. Wuh yuh duh do dey? Wuffeh hoonah br-r-ram we do?'

'Br-r-ram hoonah do' fuh wek hoonah, fuh leff we een, fuh 'scape de col'; 'im berry f'osty; me sta'be wud col'. Opey de do', an' leff we een!'

'Wey yo' is bun? Tell me say.'

'Down een de 'za'b.'<sup>a</sup>

'Wuh yuh bun duh do down de-dey een de 'za'b?'

'Bun duh fush.'

'Ketch um?'

'Sho!'

'How many?'

'Too many?'

'Lemme shum! Wey 'e dey?'

'E de-dey.'

'Wey?'

'Dey de-dey. Opey do!'

'Yunt opey do' twull me yiz shum!'

'Yunt gwine shum twull opey do!'

'Beeg talk brag; fac' dry so! Hoonah no fush; des' bun foolish 'roun' 'yuh fuh yo' bruckwuss!'

---

<sup>a</sup>De 'za'b; the reserve, a pent body of fresh water held for flooding the ricefield at the proper seasons.



'Phut! Dem eent foolish fuh bruckwuss wuh got bruckwuss een dey yan! Opey de do', an' leff we een! Me stuff ez stulya'd! \* Me sta'be wud col! Opey do'; do, mahn! Gib hoonah haff hoonah fry um fuh we; haff er dem fush, an' all hoonah kin nyam; † an' de mores' pa't bun brum.' ‡

'All er dem brum?'

'No, muh! haff er dem brum, an' all hoonah kin nyam! Not er fush mo'. Dey, 'tiz ez 'tiz; tek um ez 'tiz, er don' tek um 'tall! Dat lak er jackass gallop, sho't an' sweet! No, no, co; sweet talk nebbah duh han'lede hoe! Dish yut § mash up wud pledgah an' pain; hyuh yo' pledgah, an' dey yo' pain! Yo' gawt de fry-in'-pan; me gawt de fush; now tek um or leff' um, niggah!'

A sudden shuffle of feet inside; a suspicious clanking of iron pots:

'Wey muh fush, mahn? Yuh bun de pahn!'

'Yuh one; yuh nurrah; yuh two po' topper tarruh; yuh bun two wud dey yed tie' tergarruh; you come fo'; yuh t'ree mo'; horry up, niggah, opey de do', an' lemme hug de fiah!''

Within a certain well-defined section, i. e., Tide-Water South Carolina, Low-Country Georgia, the Sea Islands, and the north-east coast of Florida, with some slight variations, this peculiar patois is the language of the negro. || Broadly speaking, it is one of the three dialects spoken by American negroes, if we may call

\*Stiff as a steelyard, or stilliard; the arm of the rude balance used in ascertaining rough weights upon a plantation.

†Bat.

‡Bream.

§Earth.

||The late Charles Colecock Jones, Jr., of Georgia, was author of an admirable volume, "Negro Myths of the Georgia Coast," a collection of folk-stories in this difficult dialect, written with remarkable fidelity, the value of which would have been much more widely recognized but for the appearance of Mr. Harris's easier "Uncle Remus" tales, which completely overshadowed the less pretentious and more difficult work, published in 1888 by Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. This volume contains the only permanent collection of essays in this peculiar patois not farcical in their intent. The collected "Sermons of Pabson Coteney," by the late J. G. Williams, of South Carolina, are excellent in their way, but in a quite different vein; like them, and in their way excellent, but ephemeral in form, are the "Rebren Kinlaw" sermons, by A. E. Gonzales, of the Columbia, S. C., State, the dissertations of the "Reberend Isrul Manigo," by J. Palmer Lockwood, of Charleston, S. C., and brief occasional articles by T. R. Tighe, in the *Charleston News and Courier*. Mr. Harris has tentatively essayed this dialect once or twice in the character of "Daddy Jack." The only other added to these is a brief essay by William Francis Allen, prefatory to a volume of spiritual songs, published in New York, in 1867.

for convenience a *dialect* what in critical terminology may be but a grotesque patois; these three are the French Creole of Louisiana and the Mississippi delta, as written by George W. Cable; the familiar negro usage of Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, western South Carolina, middle and upper Georgia, as written by Thomas Nelson Page, Joel Chandler Harris, James Lane Allen, Polk Miller, and Frank L. Stanton; and the quaint, outlandish jargon of the swampy regions of the coastal plain. The Virginian, or Georgian, differs but little from State to State, beyond petty local variances here and there. From it the patois of the coast differs as widely as does the delta Creole. As compared to the Virginian and Louisianian the dialect of the rice-fields is a hasty and foreign sounding patois; there are those who profess to find it harsh and unpleasant. Its hurrying rustic style is as different from the dignity, and sometimes almost stately deliberateness, of upland Virginian as day is from night. A negro from the tobacco-and-corn country could hardly comprehend the negro from the rice and sea-island-cotton region; a genuine rice-field negro is with difficulty understood in the uplands of his own State.

Owing to its excessive peculiarity and consequent difficulty, the dialect has been little exploited, although richer in color, individuality, and philological interest than the simpler Virginian made famous and familiar by the tales of "Uncle Remus" and the stories of Mr. Page.\* Without long familiarity, it is difficult to speak it; without previous knowledge of it, it is hard to understand; without definite apprehension of its strange phonetic scheme, it is impossible to read it, to one's self, or aloud, with the readiness

---

\*Broadly speaking, the general statements of this commentary apply to the dialect of the entire region; but it should be understood that peculiarities and narrow and particular corruptions here described may not be universal, even here. There are all grades of negroes, from the rudest field-hands to residents of villages and house-servants, who speak with very different degrees of inaccuracy or illiteracy. There are, especially among the islands, plantations so remote from all contact with civilization as once to have developed dialects within the dialect, the characteristic speech and peculiar idioms of one plantation differing so from those of another as to make it very possible for the adept to determine by a negro's peculiarity of dialect what community, sometimes what island, and sometimes almost what plantation was the spokesman's place. Singular peculiarities upon one plantation may be—or once were—totally lacking upon the next holding though but a few miles distant. But in a greater or a less degree, these present comments apply to the entire region in which Gullah is spoken.

requisite to popularity. The peculiar sounds of its phonetic scheme are difficult to convey even vocally; its singular flatness and unusual intonation are well-nigh impossible to indicate by common use of diacritical signs; such essay would be incompetent; it is not here attempted. To indicate exact phonetic values, to suggest particular accents, stresses, tones and emphasis would call for a scheme of phonetics cumbrous and undesirable where the aim is simply to interest the alert, intelligent reader. The ordinary reader may not always catch the meaning; the shapes of the words are strange; they are the residuum of language literally worn away by use; the phonology is archaic; the engaged grammar a mystery; to the wit and to the acute phonetic sense of the reader much must inevitably be left.

Yet to the wanderer from the low country it is the sound of his lost youth. An acting commander in the United States Navy, who had not been on a southern station for forty years, although a South Carolinian by birth, exclaimed: "I had forgot; but when I heard a black man call out '*Eh! Eh!*' I knew I had come home!" Its sound is unmistakable.

The trick common to all dialects of English, of making diphthongs, at times even triphthongs, of single vowel-sounds, until the result is a serpentine, meandering out of the mouth with fascinatingly peculiar and deliberate ingenuity, is unknown to this sharp-sputtering, chattering patois.

Its phonology of quick, crackling sounds, of short, and of shortened syllables, is caused in part by excessive laxity of pronunciation, in part by the elision of every sound of which language may be shorn and still remain articulate.

Its peculiar intonation is that of the *Five and Six Stripes Coast*; its "harshness" that peculiar to the dialects of the *West Coast* south from Sierra Leone, in something comparable to the chatter of the coast-trading negro tribe, the *Jack-jacks*, who more than two centuries ago were denominated *Qua-quas*, because their speech resembled the gabbling of ducks.

Though its intonation may thus be African, its vocabulary is English; English along the line of the least resistance—paradoxically, the part that the African has added to it is that which he has omitted, or deliberately taken from it and abandoned, by elision, by muteing, by nuances of sound covering a multitude of strange omissions, by misapprehension of delicately

shaded sounds, by ignorance, by indolence, and by a constant dissipation of language into a state of fluidity.

The number of African words, phrases, and idioms retained is, comparatively, small; though conjoined with its intonation, and amount of connoted folk-lore, there remains more that is African in the *Gullah* than has been preserved in the other negro dialects.

Oddly enough—having maligned it for ignorance and barbarity—it is not composed simply of barbarous, contorted, broken English, resultant from negro ignorance, but a great part of it is the quite logical wreck of once tolerable English, obsolete in pronunciation, dialectical in its usage, yet the natural result of a savage and primitive people's endeavor to acquire for themselves the highly organized language of a very highly civilized race. Its vocabulary is for the most part English of two hundred years ago, and full seven-tenths of its peculiarities had their spring in the mouths of *Dicon Hawbake* and *Tummas Cloddipole*.

It has, indeed, been advanced in explanation of its peculiarity, particularly in one section where unusually broad, that the early settlers there were many of them Scotch, and that the endeavor of untutored Africans, deficient in sound-appreciation and delicate vocalizations, to acquire English through a Scotch medium, produced the singular inflections and enunciations which characterize the pure *Edisto Gullah*. But, though there remain, here and there, usages common to Scotland, there is not evidence sufficient to support this assumption. While the *Gullah* speaker says *kyahry*, i. e., *carry*, for *escort*, and though the close Scotch *u* is often found,\* there is not a burred *r*, or a sibilant medial *s* in the whole tongue;† and as for idiomatic usages, frequently mentioned as Scotch, they are to be found in altogether too many English shires below the *North Country*, to be laid for source at *Sawney's* door. There is, in fact, as much remnant of French influence as of Scotch; and there were, moreover, many more Scotch, or Scotch-Irish, in the up-country than in the low. The singular English of the *Gullah*-speaking negro was, in the first

\*As in "putt" for "put," and "pul" for "pull."

†The familiar Scotch "tressure" for "treasure," "measure" for "measure," and "pleasure" for "pleasure," have medial *s* or *z* changed to *dg* or *j*, "tredgeh," "medgeh," "pledgeh," etc.

place, gathered from the illiterate bond-servitors of the Colonies, uneducated English, low-bred *redemptioners*, humble Scotch, Scotch-Irish, and Irish English deportations, the greater part of whom were peasantry, from whose tongue it gathered a wealth of dialectical peculiarities, still traceable to their remote spring in the shires of Britain, where many of them still persist. This dialect spoken by low-country plantation negroes is strangely akin to the English dialects; quite as akin to England's provincial dialect as was the best English spoken in the Southern States, settled in William Shakspeare's days, or immediately thereafter, to the English of Shakspeare's plays.

It has been computed that the lowest English peasant employs in his vocabulary, as his share of the vernacular, some 500 words, which entirely cover his desires, his pleasures, and his necessities. While not believing this to be true, since patently impossible, the vocabulary of our *Gullah* patois is not less than five times as great. To express other than the simplest ideas, plain actualities, is, however, exceeding difficult; it possesses few abstractions, and no book-words, except such as are gathered from scriptural repetitions. Its vocabulary is simple; its thoughts direct; its methods expressive and picturesque. 'Tis the most truly rustic of the negro tongues. Though often heard in the city streets, it is not an urban dialect; its lurk is among the rushes with the great god Pan. In it Low Country bucolics are writ. It is true that, up to the age of four, approximately, the children of the best families, even in town, are apt to speak an almost unmodified *Gullah*, caught from brown playmates and country-bred nurses; but at that age the refinement of cultivation begins, and "the flowers o' the forest are a' weed awa!"

One often hears a Charlestonian say, "My wife cannot understand her cook half the time. She must call me in to explain." In such case it is evident the wife is an *up-country* woman or a domestic immigrant "from outside" . . . not to the manner born. Indeed, it might be a saying of the coast, though it is not, that *some men are born to Gullah, some men achieve Gullah, while some have Gullah thrust upon them: and are nonplussed.* To some *Gullah* remains a closed book. It seems to require a certain *lassigkeit* to comprehend as well as to speak it, a willingness to dispense with a number of things in language which to the

conscientious minds of the precise it seems impossible that language should do without. There are men of an unyielding mental system who, after years of residence in the *Gullah* country, find it still impossible to understand, or to make themselves understood by, the boy who lays the fire in their room. And, plantation negroes delight, though not appearing so to do, to watch a visiting stranger talk: "Dey use dem mout' so funny!" The ordinary stranger is, in nine cases out of ten, unable to exchange ideas, or to converse intelligibly with true *Gullah*-speaking negroes; nor can he understand their spokesmen. So common is this experience that an ingenious story has been founded on it, in which a modern New York blackmailer is carried by his desperate, exasperated victim to a remote plantation on Combahee River, and there sequestered under guard, unable to make himself understood by the negroes, unable to comprehend them, without other means of communicating with the outside world, until he relinquishes his despicable claim, and leaves his victim free.\*

Nor is the difficulty to the Northerner alone. It oozes through the body politic. The judge on the bench of the Federal Court has difficulty with it; and, at least on one well-known occasion, an eminent Edistonian, who sat in the auditory half-convulsed with laughter at the amusing predicament of the attorneys and bench, was summoned imperiously by the court, and under oath, constrained to act as interpreter throughout a long and important case, to turn into understandable English the jargon of the negro witnesses.

Law cases hinge upon it. In a certain familiar instance, a case of collision between two vessels passing in a heavy fog, the captain of the over-bearing craft asserted vehemently that no warning hail was given, no bell rung, no horn winded, no whistle blown by the plaintiff, to warn the mariner. "That is not so," the plaintiff declared. "My lookout gave warning in ample time; he hailed you long before you struck, and ran us down, you had ample warning." The lookout was summoned, a black man, sphinx-like, silent. "You called out to the defendant the moment you saw him through the fog?" "Me yerre† um; no shum;‡

\*A Modern Kidnapping; by D. Huger Bacot, Jr.; College of Charleston Magazine.

†Heard.

‡See them.

too long buffo' me'shum, me yerre um." "And the moment you heard them you sang out; is that not so? A grave nod assented. The plaintiff rested his case; the cross-examination began: "You hailed the sloop before you could see her; could they hear your hail? A succinct nod. "How do you know?" "Me yerre dem; dem blan\* fuh yerre we; yez yerre yondeh senkah yerre yuh."† "You hailed them then?" "Me duh holleh." "That is what I mean: you hailed the on-coming vessel?" "Me yent no sicarum;‡ me holleh one patty-augah."§ "Very well. And what did you say?" "Me say, 'Oonah kounou oonah?'"

Which is equivalent, in *Gullah*, to "*Whose boat is that?*" The records will show the outcome of the case; the writer has not the verdict recorded.

A traveller, thinking that he had surely traversed the greater part of a journey, made circuit through a clearing to ask an old negro, sitting in a cabin-door, how much of his journey still lay before him? "*De furdes' yo' gone yo' done 'em!*" was the enigmatic reply, which means, being interpreted, that he had already gone the greater part of the way, and that less than half still lay before him to be traversed.

*Gullah* has its variants, as naturally followed from the constrained remoteness of distant plantations and absence of intercourse; phrases heard on the Altamaha are unknown upon the Santee; words in use in the Georgetown District vanish at Edisto; John's Island is not St. Helena's; Silk Hope was not Toogoodoo. Yet all the remote varieties blend into one generic tongue under the common name of *Gullah*. It has changed little in seventy years, in all probability for a score before that it had maintained the characteristics peculiar to it today. To register a few of these is the purpose of the writer.

*One* is used to mean *only*, or *alone*: "*Who's there?*" you call into the darkness. "*Me, one!*" is the quick reply. Every sense of singleness, infrequency, solitariness, or aloofness is expressed by

\*Obliged.

†Ears hear yonder same as here.

‡No sicarum: no such a thing—*sic'a* is probably not *sich a*, corruption from "*such a*;" but a variant of *sakes-a* or *senka*, later explained, with euphonic *r*, and that general-purpose substantive "'um:" translation in full, "I did nothing like that.

§A piragua.

*one.* The swamp black-bird, from his solitary habit during certain seasons of the year, is called by the negroes *One-One*; a morose recluse, a misanthrope, is nicknamed *Old One-One*; where fish are biting slowly, yet steadily, they are said to bite *one-one*; solitary swallows which come in advance of the spring flights are described as coming *oney-oney*; and with the sense of *single, individual*, *one* usually replaces the indefinite article, *a*: as "*One long time dey bun one rich buccra wuh hab one lubly daughteh*;" "*dem kill one cow an' git de mores' pa't 'im libbah fuh brile*;" "*Maussa, hyuh one nice, fat fowl fuh Missus*." "*Me, one, Lo'd! me, one!*" is the agonized cry of the repentant and unredeemed which rises above the frenzied tumult, "*My God, my God! save me, one!*"

*Soon* is used as synonymous with and a substitute for *early*. *A soon brukwuss* is an *early breakfast*; a *soon sta't* is an *early start*: thence arises the first division of the negro's day, *soon er mo'nin'*; after which follow *fus' fowl-crowin'*, *day-clean*, *sun-up*, *fus' an' las' ho'n-blowin'*, *fo'noon*, *nobn-res'*, *attanoon*, *de sun duh lean*, *de sun duh lean fuh down*, *sun-down*, *deep dus'*, *ebenin'*, *can'le-lightin'*, *night-time*, *platt-eye prow!*,\* and *hag-hollerin'*.\*

"Is it day-break?" asked a Northern sportsman of the small black boy who came into the room to kindle the fire. "*E dey*," said the small boy, "*but 'e yent broke yit!*" The last horn-blow, or blast upon horn, or conch, meaning the last summons to the day's task, takes on the sense of procrastination; by day or night the dilatory are accosted with "*Wuh yo' duh do? Wait fuh de las' ho'n-blow? Come on!*" "*Dem duh wuk berry studdy twell de day big-gin fuh lean low down een de wes*," said a narrator.

Another hunter "from outside" asked an old negro whom he met in the woods, if a certain clump of trees at the top of a sandy ridge was a good deer-stand, meaning, if it be so, there to await the drive. "*Me yent kin say, mossa*," replied the old man, "*W'en oona duh de-dey, de dee' duh no de-dey; w'en oona yent dey, de dee' duh de-dey!*"† Being but a "domestic immigrant," the hunter gave it up.

\*Presumably midnight, when graves give up their dead and the spirits of the damned howl abroad, when necromancy and sorcery run rife, and hags oppress their unhappy victims: hags are witches; and platt-eyes diabolical spirits of the mist.

†When one is there, the deer is not there; when one is not there, the deer is.



"*Son Bailey patrone de pattyaugeh; bat-o Junius Turquerine; disha kounou blanks tuh we!*" was the calm reply of an ebony black man, as we sheered by the lee of the long low wharf; in English: *Son Bailey is the piragua's captain of the batteau, Junius Turquan; this canoe (a cypress dugout) belongs to us . . . .* "blanks" meaning *belongs*. Were it not for this parallel usage of *blanks* the odd use of *blan* would be hard to explain. As it is *blan* discovers itself indifferently to mean *to be obliged*, or *accustomed to*, *to belong*, *to find a necessity for being*, or *for doing*, thus or so: as "Buh Fowl-hawk mek plan fuh ketch de Sun een er trahp. 'Im set 'e trahp wey de Sun *blan* rise. W'en mc'ain' come, fus' fowl-crow' Buh Fowl-hawk pitch off de tree wey him *blan* roos', an' sail fuh de spawt way de Sun *blan* sleep." Thus, likewise, *Buh Rabbul*, when he, in turn, set up a game on *Buh Allegatuh*, laid his plans with assurance, certain that *Buh Allegatuh blan come ouden de ribbah fuh sun 'esef*. A man is usually found where he *belongs*; or where he belongs there he is obliged to be; thus where one is accustomed to be found, he *blans*. Hence "De libbah-colo'd puppy *blan* wud ol' Pinky' littuh," and "Dishyuh de place wuh dem tukrey *blan* ross'."

While, however, animate things appear thus to *belong*, or to be compelled by habit, circumstance, or nature, to follow some course, frequent a locality, submit to the arbitrary ruling of fate, inanimate objects *live*. *To belong* in such or such a place, as a box, or a gun, or a coat in a wardrobe, is *fuh lib een dat place . . . . dis buttah 'e lib een de ice-house;† dem w'ite shut libeen de draw'; de shubble lib een de tool-house; but wey de debble an' Jack Walkeh dishyuh saddle lib?* asked Davy in despair.

To these quaint uses of *live* and *blan* is added an obsolete or obsolescent, though good old English phrase: *to be accustomed to go*, *to linger about*, *to stay habitually*, or *to dwell*, is *to use*, employed as Dekker employed it, or as Fletcher, in *The Faithful Shepherdess*: "I will give thee for thy food no fish that *useth* in the mud." Quash Harleston will inform you a *ganger pa' tridge n'usen een dat fiel*, when he means that a *covey of bob-whites frequent the tract*. This usage is, however, not singular to *Gullah*,

\*O. F. patron; the ship's captain.

†Ice-chest, or refrigerator.

but provincial in the South. *To den*, meaning *to lurk*, or *to dwell*, as in *a den*, is also in use as Fletcher used it: *the bats den in the barn, the rats den under the hay-rick*.\*

A common unit of measure of area and of distance is a *tass*—the allotted day's portion of labor, a *task*, a *stent*; for a hoe-hand generally half-an-acre; for cotton-field hands, three-quarters of an acre; for the rice-field negro, usually a quarter of an acre; a man and his family can *cut a tass*, *tie a tass*, *an' carry a tass intuh de flat*. As a unit of distance, a *Gullah* black will inform you that his *two-time-one* gun, or his *one gun two-time*, that is to say, his *double-barrelled fowling piece*, can *t'row two tass*, *an' kill*. A *tass* is *fifty compass*, a *compass* being five feet,† and *fifty compass* being *fifty compass square*; thus a fowling-piece that *carries two tass*, and slays, is effective over a good radius. Distance is also sometimes further subdivided by the portion of a *tass*, a *row*: "*Yent gone!*" sulkily denies the small boy, creeping stealthily from the cabin. "*Yiz!*" cries the spy. "*Yent!*" protests the culprit, "*Yent gone mona two row!*"

From this familiar usage of the day's task, *the tass*, arises the picturesque and expressive phrase, *a done-tass niggah*, used either to mean a worn-out negro laborer, too weak, too old to work any more, or lightly, to signify the laughing darkey, his day's work done, and his hoe canted over his shoulder.

The use of *stand*, in the sense of *to be*, *to exist*, at times, literally, *to appear*, as if *to stand out*, is an archaism in common use in *Gullah*, though not often elsewhere. Says W. F. Allen:‡ "*I once asked a group of low-country negro boys the color of the sky. Nobody could tell me. Presently the father of one of the boys came by. On my repeating the question he grinned. 'Tom,' he said, 'how sky stan'?*" "*Blue!*" promptly shouted Tom." "*How does the weather stand?*" I asked my man, one morning. He looked at the heavens, and instantly, "*'E'tan' cleah, boss,*" he replied. "*'See how dem orange stan' ma'am!*" said the housemaid, pinching the fruit in the basket. "*'Dem rotten an' full of woodiness.*" "*'How you stan', ol' man?'*" is the greeting of

\*This is, perhaps, more generally, Up-Country use.

†The possible connection between this usage of *compass*, and *passus*, a pace that is, the geometrical, or great, pace, of 5 feet, is at once suggested.

‡Preface to "Slave Songs of the United States," 1867, p. 27.

courtesy to old Daddy Jack, as he shuffles rheumatically on his rounds. "*Me 'tan' not berry wut; bress Go'd!*" is the old man's reply. "*Dat bu'd two foots 'tan' red,*" was the way a negro boy described a strange bird he had seen in the woods.

To be sure, all ancient usages and archaisms are prone to corruption, as the users of them are to err: *down this here away*, as *Purchas' Pilgrimage* has it, has long since become *dishyuh'wy*; while *sprack*, as the North Countryman has it, *sprag*, as Shakspeare used it, *quick*, *nimble*, or *alert*, becomes *spratch*, a *nimble movement*.\*

But they still *wrastle*, as Gamelyn *wrasted* in the ancient *Tale*; they say *scace* for *scarce*, as Tyndale did; pronounce *end*, *eend*, as it is indicated on Caxton's tomb;† curb a spiritedly violent horse with "Whoa, suh! Don't get *ramby!*"‡ just as *Piers Plowman* might have done; say *puhwide* for *provide*, as Londoners probably did in old Dan Chaucer's day; Dean Swift rhymed *stunted* and *burnt it*; so would the *Gullah* negro; Donne rhymed *after* and *matter* and so would a *Gullah* poet. *Sensible*, in the old sense of *aware*, is constantly employed, the sick being advised *fuh mek de Docto sensubble how dem feel*; while *find*, to *supply with victuals*, as Tyndale's unfortunate "*layman, having a wife and 20 children,*" was not able to do, is in common use: *Buh Sun*, in a well-known folk-tale, promised *Buh Fowl-hawk fuh fine um een bittle effn 'e ketch 'im een 'im baid*. A group, or company of men, or of beasts, is universally known by the old Anglo-Saxon term, *gang*; as *the grass-gang*, *the rice-field gang*, *the butcher-gang*, *the hoe-gang*, *the chain-gang*, a *gang of sodgers*, a *gang of sheep*, or *fowls*, a *gang of pa'tridges*. He, and he alone, still plays sweetly upon the *quills*, as Milton did in *Lycidas*—Pan's pipes of reed, or cane, so-called from the bobbins of reed used by old-time handloom weavers, the weaver's *quills* or *reeds*; and this from the ancient *quille*, a *reed*, a *hollow stem or stalk*; as *that of a reed*; a *smooth piece of stem between two joints*. "*Buh Rabbut 'im duk play des' sweet 'pon de quills; an', w'en 'im finish all 'im chune, 'e play 'em one fuh brotus.*"§

\*Perhaps more an Up-Country usage. A rider in broken country will put his horse at a bank, crying, while he spurs, "Now, boy! make a spratch!"

†Ynd.

‡Ramby, or rammy.

§*Brotus*: lagnappe, or boot, the extra handful thrown in with a purchase. In Virginia, *broadus*. Derivation problematical.

Historical English, too, is the use of *clean* to mean *entirely, completely, totally*; as Shakspeare used it in *Coriolanus*: "*This is clean kam*;" or as Cotgrave, "*clean contrary*:" thus *day-clean* signifies *full day*; to turn *clean obah* is to turn *completely over*; to *clean out* is to fly entirely beyond the limit or border of bailiwick or section; and *clean gone* is *utterly and unqualifiedly gone*; yet this usage is, perhaps, common to the negroes of the South, bar Louisiana; as is also the use of the archaism, *element*, for the sky, the heavens, the ethereal air: "*Buh Tukrey Buzza' d duh sail 'roun een de element*," says the folk-story, "*Yully een a mo' nin' de element 'tan' bright*; to 'des noon 'e all cas' obah; hebby rain duh fall; dem cloud roll up; de l' undah bumm; de lightnin' crack!" Occasionally, but only occasionally, will be heard the use of *element* to signify the commonest fluid of earth: "*De bat-o leak. Scipio, 'im looker Mass' Alston.*" 'E say, 'Kin yo' swim good?' 'Yas,' 'spon' Mass' Alston, cayless, 'W'y? 'Cas, 'fo' Go'd, Mass' Alston, yo' gottuh! *De bawtum gone clean outen dis bat-o!*" Sho' nuff, sah, dat fo'-plank bat-o totally rockify!\* Dem draf l' rue intuh de element; dem scace is mek de sho'. Yunt know wut buc-cum er de bat-o."

Adhering to usage contemporaneous with the settlement of Carolina, pronunciations usually set down as *negro*, therefore illiterate, are traceable otherwheres. The Gullah negro says *een* for *in*, and *mo'* for *more*, in good Elizabethan style; *shets the door*, as Gower did in the 14th century; says *ax* for *ask*, like a "true-born Londoner;" *useter could*, as they do in Essex; he *stromples* when he treads heavily, as they do in Northamptonshire; he says *yowe* for *ewe*, like the Borderer and the Scotchman; *can't come if*, as does the Yorkshireman; *b' mbye*, as does Devonshire; *yo'* for *you*, as does the Derbyshireman; *eh* for *he* and *bin* for *been*, as does the Lancashireman; *yer 'e*, for *hear him*, as does the westlin' English; and *ah* or *aw* for *I*, as does the Cumberlander; unless for all first person singular pronouns, to save time and trouble, he makes use simply of *me* or *muh*. *De* for *the*, *dat* for *that*, *den* for *then*, *dem* for *them*, Sussex and Kent afforded him, long ago. His final *as* he drops like a Kentish man, and like the men of Kent he says *sodger* for *soldier*. *Bittles* for

\*Wreck, rack, rock (stone causing wreck), confused with form of *rectify*: "Noah's ark rectified on de mounting;" see further, body of article, for use of *rectify*.

*victuals* he might have had from Suffolk; his *gwine* or *gwain* from Dorset; even his, nowadays, very peculiar use, periphrastical, of *da* or *duh* for *do*, *doth*, *does* or *did*, in combination with all tenses of the verb, is only a Dorsetshire peculiarity, possibly borrowed long ago: *Moon da shine, and she da keep a-comen on*, would fall naturally enough from a Gullah negro's lips; yet it is only a quotation, from the very ancient ballad of *The Weepin' Lady*, in choicest 18th Century Dorsetshire. The only remnant of a trilled *r*, that *dog's letter*, *the letter of roughness*, *litera canina*, his whole vocabulary possesses, is that which turns the Devonshire *yer* or *yerr'e* into *yedde* from the accompanying form, *yerry* or *yerre*,\* by the failure of the trill into a mere touch of the tongue-tip. Like Irish-Englishmen he says *ca'm*, *pa'm*, *psa'm*, *a'ms*, *ca'f*, *ha'f*, *ja'nt*, *ha'nt*, *ta'nt*, *ha'nch*, *la'nch*,† making all words of that variety chime with the sound of the *a* in *gaff* and *clam*; but he has lost the delicious Irish trill of the *r*; he has hardly a uvular or tongued *r*; and as for the Northumberland *burrr-r*, it is impossible to conceive the sound in the mouth of a Southerner, let alone a speaker of Gullah, though both inevitably trail an *r* to *Ida-r*, *Emma-r*, *Ella-r*,‡ and all *a*-ended substantives whenever the final *a* is followed by an initial vowel-sound.

Even his peculiar *Enty*, *now?*, ear-mark of the Gullah speaker, used as an intensive and affirmative exclamation or rejoinder, resolves itself into provincial English particles. A Warwickshire man says *yunt it* for *is it not*, and *yunt he*, by contraction, through sheer economy of effort, from the older *be n't it*, and *be n't he*; by easy course: *be n't he*; *be(y)en't he*; *be-yent 'e*; *'e'yen't'e*; *'en't'e*; thus the familiar characteristic affirmative exclamation, *'en't'e, now?* *Enty?* as also the peasantisms, *ain't it*, *ain't he*, or *jest ain't he, now*, commonly elsewhere surviving.

\*The various forms are *yerra*, *yerre*, *yerry*, *yedde*, *yuddy*, *yeard*, *yearie*.

†The cultivated usage of low-country South Carolina, also.

‡Usage of cultivated Charlestonians.

(TO BE CONTINUED).

## Public Discussion\*

BY CHARLES A. WOODS

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina

The ultimate conclusion, after centuries of struggle and discussion, that the legal rights of the individual should not be asserted by personal violence, but through the intervention of the community, has given and is still giving birth to scores of problems as to the nature of the individual rights which the community should undertake to safeguard, and the methods it should use in the undertaking. The latest of these is the nature and extent of the right of the single individual against the power of a number of individuals magnified by combination, and of the laborer against the capitalist. The constitution of the United States probably settled more vital issues which had been under hot discussion than any other document ever penned by the hand of man, yet no equal number of words has given rise to so many issues, so much stimulating struggle and controversy.

From this jostling and tossing of social elements, to use the expressive terms of Guizot, not only come up new issues, but old rights which have been regarded settled on immutable principles are questioned and brought under revision. We are accustomed to say, for instance, that under the principles of Anglo-Saxon liberty the right of private property and the right to freedom of contract are immutable. But every lawyer knows these rights today are far different from what they were a century ago. Our neighbors and the general public now deny our right to the exclusive benefit of our property, and our right to contract as we please without considering the results to them. This and the present open discussion of the limits of private rights to contract and to use private property is most obvious in the dealings of courts and legislatures and executives with public service corporations, but it extends also to the property and dealings of individuals. There is no cause for alarm about this development. The change has come from normal social growth, and is the expression of the

---

\*A portion of an address delivered before the North Carolina Bar Association at Morehead City, June, 1908.

finest ethical sentiment of our race. It has not originated in legislative enactments, nor decisions of courts, nor in the mind of a great President, but legislatures in their statutes, courts in their reasonings and judgments, and executives in their messages and documents have only recognized and put into form the convictions of that growing public consciousness and enlightened public conscience of which they themselves are partakers.

The courts are none the less the bulwarks of individual liberty, of the right of property and the right of contract against the clamor of the populace and the demands of those who have not to take from those who have. The task of the judiciary, as indeed of all those who are set in authority, is to distinguish between popular clamor expressed in the demands of the unsuccessful and heedless and dishonest, and those fixed convictions of organized society which, after long brooding and discussion, come to be the recognized customary law of righteousness among the intelligent and honest in their dealings with each other.

For a very long time and for reasons that need not be recounted to this audience, the ideal of the publicist, of the statesman, of the jurist, of the poet, of the people themselves was individual liberty. So blindly have the people worshiped that they often transformed the Goddess of Liberty into the Juggernaut of crushing oppression. But now the conception has come to the public consciousness that liberty is not the highest civic ideal to be attained; for liberty connotes the right to personal indolence and inactivity, to the exclusive enjoyment of property and of selfish dealings at the will of the individual. The glory of our age is that its brooding and discussion has resulted in a growing apprehension of the truth that the attainment of liberty is but a step in human progress, that it is subordinate to a still greater end—that it is, in truth, mainly good as a means to that which must forever be the loftiest aim of all conflict and discussion and human endeavor—the attainment of justice, the right adjustment of all that goes to make up human life so that each individual may have his due.

Not only is liberty subordinate to justice, but all that which we call charity is harmful which goes beyond the effort to contribute to the doing of justice—that is, the effort by the use of the utmost of our powers and resources to contribute to the end that every man, according to his ability, shall have equal opportunity. No

ancient society, perhaps no society of a century ago, could have stood the strain of the struggle from selfishness to justice, and of all the other multiplying issues of this age, added to those then pressing for solution, for the effort would have been made to set them aside by decrees of the council chamber. Society stands the strain now because it invites and requires all men who have rights to assert or issues to present, affecting public custom or law, to bring them to the test of free public discussion.

The passing away of war and physical violence means only the change from these to other forms of conflict. The measure of a people's social, political and legal attainment is very slowly, but but none the less surely, passing from their armies and battleships to their capacity to state with truth, discuss with fairness, and decide with justice in their legislative halls, in their courts, in the public press and on the hustings, their internal and national problems, and to support and applaud the doing of justice by their judiciary and executive, even when apparently opposed to their material interests.

The same test of the effort to speak the truth and do justice is being applied to all professions and occupations. The best elements of society are pressing on the public mind and conscience that the sole purpose of all public discussion is to ascertain and make manifest the truth, to see the true relations and obligations of all classes and all men to each other, to the end that justice may be done.

The optimist has reason to believe the time is past when any profession or caste will be allowed to hold back any creed or custom or tradition or ethical code as too sacred for doubt and public criticism. Nor need the conservative fear that anything good will be lost in the fray. The ignorant and irreverent may jeer and trample upon the beautiful and the true along with the vile and the false; but amid the jeering and rioting of the heedless crowd there will come thousands of lovers of the truth, defending and rescuing all that was really beautiful and true. For illustration: Many hearts were made sad by the demand that Christianity should be required to make good its claim in the fierce light of free public criticism. The happy result has been the fading into insignificance of denominational creeds. When the arguments in their support were exhibited to congregations of open



minds, it became manifest that they were mere forms of words concerning the unknowable and amounted to nothing. The great resulting blessing to mankind from the decline of dogma thus brought about is difficult even to imagine.

The gradual elimination of the unknowable from the field of human discussion is releasing thousands of the best and most unselfish of men from the vain labor to accomplish an impossible task, and giving them liberty to exercise all their powers in the discussion and betterment of social relations and the real elevation of human life and aspiration; and is enabling them to attain to the belief that the highest work of man is in searching for attainable truth and using it as a force for the uplifting of humanity.

Some are saying this is an age of construction, of acting rather than discussing. This saying is only one side of the truth. Every new field of industry opened to artisans or laborers or merchants, every dark spot of the earth brought into light, every great industrial enterprise, every new factory, every new railroad injects into the life of the world new factors to be discussed and estimated in adjusting the contending claims of men. If in an age of construction, there be neglect of the duty to be forever considering and discussing plans of right adjustment of these new factors, then gross materialism will overcome the striving for justice and culture, and the souls of men will live in the dark shadow of the material world.

The phase of individual liberty as a means to the attainment of justice between nations, between the State and the citizen, and between man and man, which I am trying to emphasize, is the liberty of public discussion in speech, and in writing and printing. This liberty is valuable as an instrument for the attainment of justice, only so far as it is sanctified by the love of truth, and the effort to find it and give it expression.

I venture to think this audience will assent to the statement that the greatest danger threatening the cause of justice and, therefore, the welfare of the republic, is the speaking and writing of falsehoods for selfish ends by those who essay to influence opinion and decision by public utterance. Knowingly speaking or writing what is untrue, or advocating that which is unjust brings bankruptcy in all else, but unfortunately it often brings

rich rewards in dollars and cents. No boldness is required to speak with candor to my brethren of the relationship of the bar to this subject.

Every lawyer who perceives the advancing ethical standards of the best of our people is reviewing his own opinions and conduct. To lawyers, as to no other class or profession, are the people so much indebted for their aspirations for liberty and justice. In the dark age of the world, it was by the influence of lawyers that the true methods of evidence supplanted among men reliance on supernatural signs. This tribute is paid to the legal and medical professions by Draper:

"It is to the honor of both these professions that they never sought for a perpetuation of power by schemes of vast organization, never attempted to delude mankind by stupendous impostures, never compelled them to desist from the expression of their thoughts, and even from thinking, by alliances with civil power. Far from being the determined antagonists of human knowledge, they uniformly fostered it, and, in its trials, defended it. The lawyers were hated because they replaced supernatural logic by philosophical logic; the physicians, because they broke down the profitable but mendacious system of miracle-cures."

At the bar of the courts the open conflict of ideas, which our race has always loved, found its most common and dramatic field. To the interest of the people in these conflicts, the legal profession largely owes its influence. With this influence comes responsibility not only for righteous judgments of courts and juries, but for public standards of truth and justice. The fact that great men like Samuel Johnson, Lord Coleridge and Lord Brougham have found it necessary to defend the position that a lawyer has the right to advocate any cause, however false, shows that the doctrine has never received general assent, as in accord with the highest ideals of society.

No statute can be found and no rule can be laid down by the courts, which will not in its application to particular cases work enormous and manifest harm, unless modified in its administration by the moral sense of the bar.

The court of equity most valuable to the cause of justice is that which is held in lawyers' offices between counsel and client. When the lawyer has attained to his true power, there the con-

science of the tempted is quickened, the hopes of the oppressed renewed, and the schemes of the unscrupulous stamped with condemnation and brought to nought. There are more than enough doubtful questions of law and equity for the advocacy of equipped lawyers and the decision of capable courts. The lawyer who is a fearless and wise judge in his own office is honored and relied on by the courts as well as the people. All professions and all men have a right to a degree of business and social secrecy. No man is bound to give to the less diligent and capable fair plans and methods which he has devised for his own advancement; but he is a conspirator and an enemy of his country, who uses business methods which he fears to have brought to the light lest he be convicted of duplicity or lawlessness.

The effort to apply to the legal profession a different standard from that by which other business men are judged is mere sophistry. Public criticism is the real safeguard of the honest man, lawyer as well as layman, who so behaves himself that he is always ready with open front and unblanched cheek to challenge the judgment of his fellow-citizens on the plans he devises and the causes he advocates. But in the long run, it will be the sure destruction of him who by concealment and evasion excites the imagination of the public into the belief that his methods are unlawful and his gains unfair. One of the highest duties of the bar is to bring statutes to the test of the constitution and judicial utterances to the test of precedent and common sense in open debate in the courts; but the lawyer who lends his learning and ability to evasion of the law, as it is established, is not only untrue to his profession, but arrays himself with the lawless, and, therefore, with the enemies of the State. And the greater the power and the influence of his client in whose behalf it is done, the greater his crime.

When we come to political discussion, exaggeration and misrepresentation are still so common that it is hard to realize there has been progress in speaking the truth since the early days of the republic. But respect for the truth has increased, even among self-seeking politicians, with the increasing capacity of the people to recognize falsehood, and their disposition to rebuke it.

I venture to think the form of falsehood now most pernicious in political discussion is flattery of the people. Nothing is more

important to a people than pride in the past achievement of their country and confidence in their own capacity for attainment, but no less important is it that they should see clearly how far they fall short of attaining that of which they are capable. Few will doubt that spread-eagle declamation about the grand old States of Massachusetts, and South Carolina, and North Carolina, has done more to increase provincial complacency than to stimulate patriotic effort. Free government rests in great measure on the principle that the gain of the people from public discussion and consideration of the questions, which they are called to act on in political life and in the administration of justice, more than counterbalances the evil results of the ignorant taking part in the government. But the principle fails when the people are flattered into believing that the voting of the ignorant is not in itself an evil, and that the ignorant and indifferent are of right entitled to as much power as the intelligent and patriotic. The growth of national character, taste, and achievements depends on the capacity of the people to listen to true discussion and criticism of their customs, ideals and prejudices, to be steady and express their conclusions in lawful and orderly manner, and to abide patiently the result.

As editors of newspapers rarely run for public office, as a class they are free from the vice of flattery of the people at large; but they often make up for their candor in dealing with the multitude by exaggerating the virtues as well as the vices of the individual citizen. There is, however, no more curious mixture of good and bad in public expression than that contained in a newspaper having on one page stories about politics, science, art and society, manufactured for sensation with no regard for the truth, and on the other editorials replete with the highest sentiments and exhortations to truth and righteousness.

Even the political and social reformer is often the propagator as well as the victim of his own falsehood and exaggeration. The heresy is prevalent among those who distrust the capacity and disposition of the people to receive and act upon the truth, that in addition to true enthusiasm and persistency, there must be exaggeration and distortion of the evils that afflict society, in order to arouse the people to righteous indignation. To this end facts, especially statistics, are so taken out of their relation to

other facts as to make them in reality falsehoods. As the result of such falsehoods men have suffered miseries and oppressions and wars without number.

Not only so, but after such spasms of exaggerated activity, we become alarmed at our frenzy and sink back into excess of repose, saying, it is true there is still much evil, but after such an excess of disturbance we must let society and business have a rest from its progress towards righteousness and justice. This we have done on the subject of the making and codification of the laws, the liquor traffic, the control of the power of wealth, the regulation of railroad traffic and many other things. Some think that this oscillation between violence and recession will always be necessary to reform; but the pessimist alone will so limit the power of modern culture to produce moderation.

No doubt, in our day, and perhaps for generations to come, there will be recurrence of storms of public excess in communities and nations, bringing evil as well as good, and sometimes that sum of all injustice—war. But progress toward exact truth and moderation in the past is earnest of greater progress in the future. There is, indeed, no greater demand of organized society than that excesses of social and political opinion and action should be avoided, that reform should be sought by the slow process of stating the truth, and that injustice should be remedied by the careful discrimination which comes from full investigation. The whole of what we are trying to express may be summed up in Bagehot's happy phrase, "animated moderation." That suggestive writer says:

"One may incline to hope that the balance of good over evil is in favor of benevolence; one can hardly bear to think that it is not so; but anyhow it is certain that there is a most heavy debit of evil, and that this burden might almost all have been spared us if philanthropists as well as others had not inherited from their barbarous forefathers a wild passion for instant action."

No people of the earth have more cause to know and be warned of the results of wild political frenzy than the people of the Southern States. In such a frenzy, which lasted for many years, the people of the United States attempted to make good the proposition that no racial history or discipline was necessary to the capacity for self-government, and the still madder proposition

that two races thousands of years apart could jointly carry on a government on terms of equality. These propositions were formulated into political creed by constitutional amendment. In the madness of it all, no account was taken of the fact that natural laws cannot be repealed by constitutions. This effort to repeal social law was as hopeless of accomplishment as would have been a law that the Southern people should not use the law of gravitation in their material development. But the struggle against its enforcement has been fraught with the most serious consequences in retarding the political and intellectual advancement of the people of the Southern portion of the United States, by shutting them up to one political party and concentrating their political energies on the discussion and decision of local issues.

The greater the issues an individual or a people are called on to discuss and solve, the greater will be the sense of individual and public responsibilities, the deeper will be the resulting culture, and the more solid and beneficent their achievement. The South has been shut out from discussion and action on the great national and international issues which concern all Americans. When a people are thus bound hand and foot to one political party, and excluded from participation in the discussion and decision of issues between that party and its opponents, it is manifest that their political and legal intelligence must decline. Serious as this result is, it is only one of the consequences of this sad condition; for political liberty is founded on individual choice, and, as government is now organized, the only choice is between parties. Those who are without the opportunity for such choice have no voluntary part in the conduct of Federal policy and in a political sense are not free men in their relation to the general government.

From this condition of being without the light of political discussion and shut up to one political dogma, a people tend to become more narrow and intolerant, and to degenerate into political bigots. Not only political bigotry, but bigotry on all subjects must always result from the lack of political discussion. It cannot be denied that this narrowness has progressed to the point of showing in some of the public men of the South extreme views, complacency of thought, haste of action, extravagance of

speech and shrewdness in feeling for the opinion of the people, rather than courage in trying to lead that opinion; and of causing in the people themselves a degree of hopeless lethargy as to the affairs of this great country. Nor have the civil results been confined to the South. They have infected the whole country. For example, the dominance of one school of political thought, due to sectional division, has made New England no less provincial than the South, her people never doubting their own holiness and wisdom.

I am trying to speak with soberness and moderation in saying that for these reasons, if we are to be permanently held in the shackles, to be kept in this political prison-house, we of the South shall suffer the most dreadful penalty that has been inflicted on a defeated people since the Duke of Alva ravished the Netherlands.

The task of this generation is to regain our political freedom, to take part in the discussion of national and international questions, to choose between the policies of national parties, to participate in the government of the United States, to possess the moral and intellectual culture which comes from discussion and responsibility, and to do our part along with our fellow citizens of other sections, in counsel and in action for the advancement of our common country. The attainment of this end, without the impossible condition of racial mixture in politics and society, is calling for the exercise of the best powers of every patriot in the South, and the necessity to attain it is sinking deeper and deeper into the conviction of every American.

But in the struggle for this, and in its attainment, let us not forget that there is another trial of equal significance before this people. Search the chronicles of men and you will find the supreme test of national as well as individual virtue is not prowess in combat, but what the victor does to the vanquished after the conquest is over, what the strong do to the weak who have fallen under their power.

In 1865 the people of the South fell under the power of the people of the North. The North failed under the test and yielded to the temptation of unbridled fanaticism. To us has come the same temptation and the same danger. The negroes in the South have fallen under our power, and on our capacity to do justice to them, in private dealing as well as in public action, depended, in

a large degree, our character and future life as a people. For the doing of injustice is more direful in its effects on the doer than on the sufferer. He is no patriot who does not stand up for the right of every man to have the just reward of his labor, to have the right of trial for his life, his liberty and property under the guidance of the law of the land,—who is not ready to breast any storm to see that there shall be one law for the weak and the strong.

History is strewn with the wrecks of nations, borne down and overcome by the great problems, which they could not escape and could not solve. But there is no record of the failure or destruction of any nation which submitted its problems to the test of full public discussion by its citizens, with adequate safeguard in its laws and in the character and customs of its people to secure deliberate judgment, after consideration of the real facts. To bring about this condition in the laws of our country and in the character and customary thought of our people is the call to every man of power. In truth, it is the highest civic aim of every man whether his power be in the form of wealth, or culture, or official station, or of love of country and humanity. For upon the capacity of the American people to secure by their laws, their character, and their customs, deliberate judgment after full discussion and consideration of real facts, depends their progress towards justice; and, hence, their right to increasing influence and power among the nations of the earth.



## Robert E. Lee Once More

CHARLES FORSTER SMITH

Professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin

Perhaps it was because I was homesick that I took to reading a few weeks ago about the noblest character whom my native Southland has yet produced. I am conscious that I have perhaps idealized Southern character in the course of the thirteen years that I have been away from home, and I wanted to refresh and confirm my convictions by reading the story of that supreme crisis when men's souls were tried and General Robert E. Lee was our foremost man. I was curious, too, to see whether the General Lee of my boyish enthusiasm would seem the same under the quieter and closer scrutiny of middle life. I have been fully repaid. General Lee is a greater man, a more stainless character, than I had ever dreamed. There is absolutely no littleness about that majestic man. He was worthy of the unparalleled devotion of his army and his people during the war, and the best thing we can still do for the formation of the highest ideals of manhood in our Southern youth is to call and re-call their attention to our stainless hero. I have read eagerly book after book on the Civil War recently—am just finishing the ninth volume (Grant's "Memoirs"). Incidentally I have recovered some of my lost youth and have recalled the moments when I saw with my own eyes one or other of the Confederate heroes whose deeds of glory I have found recorded on the printed page. How it quickens your interest if you have seen in the flesh the hero you read about! I never saw General Lee, but it is perhaps pardonable if under the impulse of my present enthusiasm I group together some of the most striking facts in the life of the great soldier who is probably to be forever the South's ideal of manhood.

Robert E. Lee was always good: a model boy, an exemplary youth, a man of stainless life. No one was ever heard to censure his conduct or his character. At school preparing for West Point he was "never behind at his studies, never failed in a single recitation." At West Point he never received a demerit; was adjutant of the corps, the post of honor in his senior year, and graduated second in his class. "He was the most punctual man

I ever knew," said his son. "He was always ready for family prayers, and at all meal times, and met every engagement, business or social, on the moment." From him was heard "never a word that might not have been uttered in the presence of the most refined woman." He never drank liquor. A bottle of fine old whiskey which a Virginia lady persuaded him to take to the Mexican war he brought back unopened. In 1861 a friend from Norfolk forced upon him two bottles of good old "London Dock" brandy, but these he kept untouched all through the war until compelled to use them during a severe illness of one of his daughters after the war. Alexander Stephens, who was greatly impressed with the manly soldier on his first interview, when seeking to win him to the service of the newly formed Confederate States government, says: "I did not know then that he used no stimulants, was free even from the use of tobacco, and that he was absolutely stainless in his private life. I did not know, as I do now, that he had been a model youth and young man; but I had before me the most manly and entire gentleman I ever saw."

General Lee was five feet and eleven inches in height and weighed usually about one hundred and seventy-five pounds. In the Mexican campaign, when about forty years of age, "he was," says General Wilcox, "in full manly vigor and the handsomest man in the army." Fifteen years later (1863) Stonewall Jackson said of him, "General Lee is the most perfect animal form I ever saw." Dr. J. William Jones says of him in 1862: "At this time General Lee was certainly one of the most superb looking soldiers the world ever saw. I had first seen him on the day when he came to offer his sword to the State that gave him birth—the home of his love. Then he had a smooth face, save a moustache, and his hair had only a few silver threads in it. Now he had a full beard and that and his hair were as white as the driven snow; but his graceful, knightly bearing, and his eagle eye, and the very expression of his countenance all betokened mingled firmness and gentleness and showed him the true soldier. But when mounted he sat his horse with easy grace, seemed indeed a part of the horse, and was the finest horseman I ever saw." "Traveler," said Capt. W. Gordon McCabe, "always stepped as if conscious that he bore a king upon his back."

In the Mexican War he made a great impression upon the

whole army and especially upon General Scott. He received repeatedly honorable mention in the commanding general's reports and was three times promoted. When a public reception was tendered General Scott by the city of Richmond after the Mexican War, he wrote, "Captain R. E. Lee is the Virginian who deserves the credit of that brilliant campaign." In 1857 General Scott, in writing to the Secretary of War to ask a second lieutenancy for young W. H. Fitzhugh Lee, then a student at Harvard, said, "I make this application mainly on the extraordinary merits of the father, the very best soldier I ever saw in the field." To General Preston General Scott said on one occasion, long before the Civil War, "I tell you that if I were on my deathbed tomorrow, and the President of the United States should tell me that a great battle was to be fought for the liberty or slavery of the country, and he asked my judgment as to the ability of a commander, I would say with my dying breath, 'Let it be Robert E. Lee.'" To a New York banker General Scott said before the war: "Col. Robert E. Lee is not only the greatest soldier of America, but the greatest man living in the world. . . . And if he ever gets the opportunity he will prove himself the greatest captain of history." The position that General Scott deemed him worthy of—Commander of the United States Army—was offered him by President Lincoln in the spring of 1861, and declined. General Long quotes from a letter this account of the offer made through Mr. Francis Preston Blair: "Mr. Blair: I come to you on the part of President Lincoln to ask whether any inducement that he can offer will prevail on you to take command of the Union Army?" "Colonel Lee: If I owned the four millions of slaves, I would cheerfully sacrifice them to the preservation of the Union, but to lift my hand against my own State and people is impossible." The best confirmation of the truth of this report of the offer is General Lee's letter to Hon. Reverdy Johnson, February 25, 1868: "After listening to his remarks, I declined the offer he made me of the command of the army that was to be brought into the field, stating as candidly and conscientiously as I could that, though opposed to secession and deprecating war, I could take no part in the invasion of the Southern States."

It is needless now to say that the campaigns in Virginia fulfilled all General Scott's predictions. The following estimate of the

commander-in-chief of the armies of Great Britain, General Sir Garnett Wolsley, will more and more come to be recognized everywhere as not overdrawn: "I have met many of the great men of my time, but Lee alone impressed me with the feeling that I was in the presence of a man who was cast in a grander mould and made of different and finer metal than all other men. He is stamped upon my memory as being apart and superior to all others in every way, a man with whom none I ever knew and few of whom I have read are worthy to be classed. When all the angry feelings aroused by secession are buried with those that existed when the Declaration of Independence was written; when Americans can review the history of this last great war with calm impartiality, I believe all will admit that General Lee towered far above all men on either side in that struggle. I believe he will be regarded not only as the most prominent figure of the Confederacy, but as the greatest American of the nineteenth century, whose statue is well worthy to stand on an equal pedestal with that of Washington, and whose memory is equally worthy to be enshrined in the hearts of all his countrymen."

The spirit of the chivalrous soldier and humane man characterized all his conduct in war, and he was wholly free from malice or vindictiveness. "We make war only upon armed men," he said in his general orders to his army on first invading Pennsylvania; he "earnestly exhorted the troops to abstain with most scrupulous care from unnecessary or wanton injury of private property," and "enjoined upon all officers to arrest and bring to summary punishment all who should in any way offend against the orders on the subject." On one occasion he was seen to dismount from his horse and put up a farmer's fence, to set a good example to his soldiers. Soon after the war, when he had been indicted for treason by a Federal grand jury, a party of gentlemen were spending an evening at his house in Richmond, and Rev. Dr. — led in the expression of bitterness felt by the South at this indictment. General Lee followed him to the door when he left and said: "Doctor, there is a good old book, which I read and you preach from, which says, 'Love your enemies, do good to them who hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you.' Do you think your remarks this evening were quite in the spirit of that teaching?" Then General Lee added:

"I have fought against the people of the North because I believed they were seeking to wrest from the South her dearest rights. But I have never cherished toward them bitter or vindictive feeling, and have never seen the day when I did not pray for them." One day in the autumn of 1869 Dr. Jones found General Lee standing at his gate, from which a humbly clad man was moving away. "That is one of our old soldiers who is in necessitous circumstances," remarked the General. On being asked to what command he belonged, General Lee replied, "He fought on the other side, but we must not remember that against him now." This poor Union soldier said to Dr. Jones afterwards: "He is the noblest man that ever lived. He not only had a kind word for me, but he gave me some money to help me on my way."

To control one's self is greater than to conquer enemies, and "self-restraint is the highest form of self-assertion." "I never in my life saw in him the slightest tendency to self-seeking," said Jefferson Davis. After the Mexican War Robert E. Lee said, "Such [favors] as he [the President] can conscientiously bestow I shall gratefully receive and have no doubts that these will exceed my deserts." Concerning the promotion of Jos. E. Johnston to be brigadier-general in 1860, Lee, who had previously ranked Johnston, said, "I rejoice in the good fortune of my old friend Joe Johnston, for while I should not like, of course, that this should be taken as a precedent in the service, yet, so far as he is concerned, he is in every way worthy of the promotion, and I am glad that he received it." When Gen. Jos. E. Johnston was claiming that he should rank first among the five *full* generals in 1862, General Lee used to say, "Oh, I care nothing about rank. I am willing to serve anywhere that I can be most useful." He had proved that by his acceptance of an inferior command in West Virginia in the summer of 1861. When that campaign proved unsuccessful he showed President Davis that but for the failure of subordinates victory would have been won, but he begged the President not to speak of it, saying, "I would rather rest under unjust censure myself than injure those who are doing what they can for the cause." The same spirit characterized him in the fall of 1861 when sent to look after the coast defences of Georgia and South Carolina.

General Lee scrupulously refrained from using his position to

advance the fortunes of his kindred. His son, R. E. Lee, Jr., though he had been captain of a company of students at the University of Virginia, enlisted as a private in the artillery in 1862, and remained so until appointed to a lieutenancy in the staff of his brother, W. H. Fitzhugh Lee, when the latter was promoted to be brigadier-general. Late in the war President Davis wished to appoint another son, G. W. Custis Lee, to the command of the army in southwest Virginia, making him major-general, or lieutenant-general, or even full general, that he might rank any other officer eligible to that position. All that was necessary was that General Lee should order his son to that command; but this he declined to do. "I cannot pass my tried officers," he said, "and take for that important position a comparatively new man, especially when that man is my own son."

Consideration for, and sympathy with others, was as characteristic of General Lee as was his lack of self-seeking. This was evident already in the boy's conduct toward his invalid mother. Dr. J. William Jones says of him at this period: "So Robert was the housekeeper, carried the keys, attended to the marketing, managed all of the outdoor business, and took care of his mother's horses. At the hour when the other school boys went to play he hurried home to order his mother's drive, and would then be seen carrying her in his arms to the carriage and arranging her cushions with the gentleness of an experienced nurse." When he went to West Point, his mother was heard to say, "How can I live without Robert? He is both son and daughter to me." On one vacation from West Point, finding his mother's old coachman "Nat" threatened with consumption, he took him to the milder climate of Georgia and secured for him the best medical advice and attention. The following incident is told by a Federal soldier whose leg was shattered on the last day of the battle at Gettysburg. Seeing General Lee pass near, the wounded man defiantly shouted "Hurrah for the Union!" General Lee dismounted and came toward him. "I confess," said the Federal soldier, "at first I thought he meant to kill me." But General Lee took his hand, looked kindly into his eyes, and said, "My son, I hope you will soon be well." "If I live a thousand years," added the soldier, "I shall never forget the expression on General Lee's face. . . . I cried myself to sleep on the bloody ground."

The love and devotion of his soldiers for General Lee was beautiful, and no wonder. "It was his constant habit," said Senator Withers, "to turn over to the sick and wounded soldiers in the hospital such delicate viands as the partiality of friends furnished for his personal consumption." His wife, who was an invalid confined to a rolling-chair, spent her time knitting socks for the soldiers, inducing others around her to do the same, and his letters to her are full of evidence that he found time amid all his duties and cares to distribute them to the soldiers. In June, 1864, a lady sent him a fine peach—the first he had seen for two years—and he sent it to an invalid lady in whose yard his tents were pitched. On the final retreat from Petersburg to Appomattox he turned aside for a few minutes to call upon the widow of one of his officers who had fallen in battle. Intimately connected with this consideration of others was his invariable courtesy. At Lexington after the war, "even amid his pressing duties at the college he found time to be the most thoroughly polite gentleman in the community. He seemed to think himself called on to visit all strangers who came to Lexington, and frequently surprised and delighted them by an unexpected courtesy."

General Lee's attitude toward money is a perpetual protest against the greed for gold that characterizes so large a part of the American people. In the fall of 1863 the city of Richmond offered him a house for his family, but he declined it, suggesting "that whatever means the city council may have to spare for this purpose may be devoted to the relief of the families of our soldiers in the field." After the war tempting pecuniary offers were often made him. An English nobleman wished to bestow upon him a country estate with an annuity of £3,000. But he declined, saying, "I must abide the fortunes and share the fate of my people." In August, 1865, he accepted the presidency of Washington College at a salary of \$1,500. After this he was asked to be the head of a large business house in New York to represent Southern commerce, with a salary of \$50,000. His reply was: "I am grateful, but I have a self-imposed task which I must accomplish. I have led the young men of the South in battle; I have seen many of them die on the field; I shall devote my remaining energies to training young men to do their duty in life." An insurance company—the Southern in which Hampton, B. H. Hill, Gordon,

and other distinguished ex-Confederates were directors—offered him the presidency at a salary of \$10,000. His answer was, "I feel that I ought not to abandon the position I hold at Washington College at this time or as long as I can be of service to it." "We do not," said the distinguished Confederate officer sent to make him the offer, "wish you to give up your present position, General, or to discharge any duties in connection with our company. The truth is we only want *your name* connected with the company. That would amply compensate us for the salary we offer you." His face flushed as he replied, "I am sorry, sir, that you are so little acquainted with my character as to suppose that my name is for sale at any price." When General Ewell contributed \$500 to the funds of the college on condition that it be applied to increasing General Lee's salary, he declined it, writing General Ewell, "I already receive a larger amount from the college than my services are worth." In April, 1870, while General Lee was away seeking health, the board of trustees deeded to Mrs. Lee the president's house and provided her an annuity of \$3,500. The residence had been constructed under his watchful eye, but he would use it only as a president's house; the gift of the annuity he declined, saying, "I am unwilling that my family should become a tax to the college, but desire that all its funds should be devoted to the purposes of education. I know that my wishes on this subject are equally shared by my wife. I feel full assurance that in case a competency should not be left to my wife, her children would never suffer her to want." After General Lee's death, the trustees sent Mrs. Lee a check for the first quarter of the annuity, but she promptly returned it, with a beautiful letter of thanks, saying that she could not accept the annuity or the house, but was prepared to give place to the new president whom they should elect. The new president chosen was, however, her own son, and so Mrs. Lee continued to occupy the house until her death.

With all his great qualities General Lee was a sincere and humble Christian. Nearly every letter from the front in war, as well as those in times of peace, contains an expression of his trust in God and his submission to the heavenly will. He fostered the religious spirit among the soldiers in his army; and his anxiety for the spiritual welfare of the students under his charge at Wash-



ington College was expressed in his remark to a clergyman, "Oh! Doctor, if I could only know that all of the young men in the college were good Christians, I should have nothing more to desire." His very last act, at the meeting of the vestry of his church the evening he was stricken down, was to subscribe the amount necessary to cover the deficit in his pastor's salary.

Is it not absolutely clear from the foregoing incidents and illustrations not only that General Lee was in war "a phenomenon," as Stonewall Jackson said—"the only man I would be willing to follow blindfolded," but also the purest and best of men? He was our first gentleman, a Christian hero, without self-seeking, without avarice, without malice or vindictiveness, without vice, kind and considerate, tender and forgiving, a knightly man without fear and without reproach. As Major Daniel said in his great memorial address, "To him who thus stood by us we owe a debt immeasurable, and as long as our race is upon earth, let our children and our children's children hold that debt sacred." If we teach them to do that, we are providing them with the greatest safeguard in the struggles and temptations of life. To know and revere and look up to a character like General Lee's is the best thing that can be taught the youth of our land. "On God and god-like men we build our trust."

There are a few scenes in the life of General Lee I should like especially to have witnessed; for example, that described by Major John W. Daniel just after Gettysburg. General Lee had said, on the failure of Pickett's glorious charge, "It was all my fault;" but his men knew better. "We saw him standing by the roadside with his bridle-rein over his arm, on the second day afterwards, as the army was withdrawing. Pickett's division filed past him; every general of the brigade had fallen, and every field officer of its regiments; a few tattered battle flags and a few hundreds of men were all that was left of the magnificent body, 5,000 strong, who had made the famous charge. He stood with uncovered head, as if he reviewed a conquering host, and with the conqueror's look upon him. With proud step the men marched by, and as they raised their hats and cheered him there was the tenderness of devoted love, mingled with the fire of battle in their eyes." Again I should have liked to see Gregg's Texas brigade moving forward to the charge to restore the broken lines, cheering the Gen-

eral as they passed him, and Lee so moved by their greeting and their gallant bearing that he spurred his horse through an opening in the trenches and followed, while the whole line shouted as it rushed forward, "Go back, General Lee, go back!" Again I should like to have been a witness at Spottsylvania six days later—May 12th—when the Federals were pouring through the broken lines threatening disaster, and General Lee had ridden forward to the head of Gordon's column. General Gordon, perceiving his intention to lead the charge, spurred to his side and seizing his reins exclaimed: "General Lee, this is no place for you. Do go to the rear. These men behind you are Georgians, Virginians, and Carolinians. They have never failed you on any field. They will not fail you here. Will you, boys?" "No, no, we will not fail him." Then turning his horse and urging him back, they shouted, "General Lee to the rear, General Lee to the rear!" Then General Gordon led them on with the ringing words, "Forward, charge, and remember your promise to General Lee."\*

Those were scenes of his triumph, but he was greater still in the hour of humiliation. When he had arranged terms with General Grant and surrendered his army and was returning to his quarters, this is what happened. "As he rode slowly along the lines hundreds of his devoted veterans pressed around the noble chief, trying to take his hand, touch his person, or even lay a hand upon his horse, thus exhibiting for him their great affection. The General then, with head bare and tears flowing freely down his manly cheeks, bade adieu to the army. 'Men, we have fought through the war together. I have done my best for you; my heart is too full to say more.'" It was a farewell scene worthy of the peerless general and his heroic army. He had hoped to return home unobserved; but as he rode through the streets of Richmond, a body of Federal soldiers recognized him, lifted their hats and cheered. His own people, too, did him homage. "Men, women and children crowded around him, cheering and waving hats and handkerchiefs. It was more like a welcome to a conqueror than to a defeated prisoner on parole."

---

\*The intensity of the musketry fire in this battle of May 12th, it may be remarked, was perhaps never exceeded in warfare. A hickory-tree, 18 inches in diameter, between the opposing lines, was so chipped away by the hail of bullets that the first gust of wind blew it down. It is now preserved as a memento at Washington.

Such scenes show the marvellous affection and admiration which soldiers and citizens had for the great leader of armies, but I have heard of another which touches my heart not less. He was presiding in faculty meeting at college one day after his health had become frail, and in the midst of the discussion dropped off to sleep; instantly every voice was hushed in reverential silence for fear of awakening him.

## Governor Hughes: A New Type of Executive

BY WILLIAM H. GLASSON

*Professor of Economics in Trinity College*

"You're the only governor we ever had," cried an enthusiastic citizen of Brooklyn the other day during the meeting at which Governor Hughes was notified of his renomination. The crowd applauded the sentiment and cheered the Governor, and the newspapers reported that he smiled and seemed greatly pleased. Perhaps there passed through his mind the fact that two years before, in accepting his first nomination, he had promised an administration "free from taint of bossism or of servitude to any private interest," and that, a year later, before the Republican Club of New York, he had said: "I want simply to be governor during my term." All men knew that he had been governor. He had kept faith absolutely with the people of his State. He had won their trust by bringing straight home to them their personal responsibility for good government. And his renomination came, without effort on his part, at the demand of a public opinion not only state-wide but national.

The people of the country without regard to party or section have felt a growing interest in Governor Hughes's public career. When he took office, he was described as academic, coldly intellectual, and lacking in those sympathetic and genial qualities which would put him in touch with the plain people. And yet in less than two years he has so strongly impressed the popular imagination that his renomination was a matter of concern throughout many States and that so shrewd a politician as the President of the United States felt that a failure to renominate him might jeopardize the success of the Republican national ticket. As an effective campaign speaker, he has come to be in such leading demand that the campaign managers of his own State are obliged to contest for his services with the national campaign managers. And his speeches are proving, in their capacity to put enthusiasm and spirit into the party ranks, to be scarcely second to those of the candidate for the presidency. Under such circumstances we must turn with unusual interest to the recently pub-

lished volume of Governor Hughes's addresses.\* Perhaps here we may find something of the secret of his success.

President Schurman of Cornell University has written an introductory chapter for this collection of essays and papers. He speaks with exceptional discernment and authority and from a close acquaintance with Mr. Hughes's personality and work. One may note that in passing he pays a handsome tribute to President Roosevelt. With regard to Governor Hughes's first nomination, Dr. Schurman says: "As a most sagacious party leader, the President [Roosevelt] recognized in the hero of the gas and insurance investigations a name to wrest victory in a critical contest in his own State. I believe that in the interest of the party he urged the nomination, and that this pressure was the deciding influence in the convention." But, while this was true, Dr. Schurman points out that Mr. Hughes was not in any sense an aspirant for office. In fact, he rather held himself aloof from it, as though the matter were no concern of his. Hence, he could not be expected "to thank any person or persons for the nomination," for that "would have been tantamount to the confession that these persons had done him a favor." When, however, the people of the State called him to their highest office by a handsome majority, though all other candidates on the same ticket with him were defeated, he was moved to make a record which would justify their confidence.

The circumstances of Governor Hughes's first nomination have been very nearly repeated in his second. Again the bosses were hostile; again Mr. Hughes declined to exert himself in any way to secure the nomination; again the deciding influence which made him the candidate was exerted by the President of the United States. But in the last analysis, he was nominated because public opinion demanded that action—because his record, distinguished by courage, independence, and an unusual moral quality, makes a strong appeal to the American people.

In these addresses and papers we find several expressions of the position which Governor Hughes has taken with regard to the holding of public office. Perhaps his most striking expression

---

\*Addresses and Papers of Charles Evans Hughes, Governor of New York, 1906-1908. With an Introduction by Jacob Gould Schurman. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York, 1908,—xxxviii, 289 pp.

on the subject was before the Republican Club of New York in October, 1907, when he said: "I do not seek any public office. The majority of people doubtless think that the distinction and power of office are an irresistible attraction. If you had been constantly in my company during the past nine months you would see that another point of view is quite possible. To me public office means a burden of responsibility—a burden of incessant toil at times almost intolerable—which under honorable conditions and at the command of the people it may be a duty and even a pleasure to assume, but is far from being an object of ambition. I have not sought, nor shall I seek, directly or indirectly, to influence the selection or the vote of any delegate to any convention, and with reference to the action of any delegate to any convention there will be no suggestion or thought of influence, protest, or reprisal in the Executive Chamber."

Such sentiments seem very impractical in this age of practical men. They savor of distant and legendary days of democratic simplicity when a Cincinnatus, urgently called from his plow to the public service, was rejoiced when the time came to put aside the cares of state and resume his plowing where he had left it. If the occupants of most other executive chambers are to be judged by their acts, they take a different view of public office. Perhaps the modern view better suits modern times when conscious virtue employs an advertising manager and subscribes to a clipping bureau. It is easy to point out that the people of New York State might never have had the chance to vote for Governor Hughes if another executive had not been willing to seek to influence delegates and to exert pressure upon conventions. But this much is true. If a man who looks upon public office as does Governor Hughes is intrusted with power by the people, he is in the best possible position to conduct his administration in an efficient and disinterested manner. He is not a party champion, so embroiled in the struggle for office and power that his acts are constantly open to suspicion and misconception, but rather the executive of all the people. As such he will have a better chance of success in the objects which Governor Hughes has thus set forth: "It has been sought to conduct the public affairs solely in the interest of the people and not in behalf of any special interest or for selfish purposes, and not for partisan advantage save as

fideliity and efficiency may have their due reward in public confidence. This may seem a counsel of perfection, and of course human nature is not changed by official relations. But the welfare of the State depends upon the maintenance of this standard, and if there is one thing more than another for which I desire the present administration to stand, it is for disinterestedness in public service."

Having been called to the duty and responsibility of office, Governor Hughes has regarded himself as holding a retainer direct from the people. He has proposed those policies which he thought for the public advantage. But he has not sought to secure their enactment through bargains with political leaders, through threats of reprisal or punishment in the matter of appointments or vetoes, or through the offer of political support or preferment. On the contrary, when his proposals have met with the most threatening and dangerous opposition, he has relied steadfastly and solely upon the strength of the public opinion created by a direct advocacy of their merits before the people of the State. Great masses of citizens of New York have come to feel a personal interest in, and a responsibility for, his success or failure. He has acted upon the theory that the American people, when their attention has once been gained, will respond to appeals to their reason and moral sense. Thus far he has been successful. Politicians who began by sneering at his appeals to the people soon began to fear them. Many who disregarded the public opinion which came to the Governor's support have already been retired to private life.

The two great tests of the Hughes methods have been in the matter of the Public Service Commissions Law and in that of the Anti-Gambling Acts. Governor Hughes's plan for the regulation of the public service corporations of New York State was, as Dr. Schurman says, "the most thoroughgoing and radical measure of the kind that has ever been enacted by any legislature in America." It was a constructive piece of work which went much further for the protection of the investor and of the public than does the national railroad legislation with which President Roosevelt has been identified. Yet its passage was secured against strong opposition by open and public methods exclusively, and it was passed practically as the Governor drafted it. The volume

before us shows some of the steps in its progress. Early in January, 1907, a message was sent to the legislature recommending the passage of a Public Service Commissions Law. The need of the measure was explained convincingly and at length. After the measure had been in the hands of the legislature for about three months, the Governor began to go before the people of the State in support of his proposal. At Utica, Glens Falls, Buffalo, and Elmira, we find him arguing his case before the people in a series of addresses in which he met and answered objections with great frankness and with a logic which was conclusive. In manner and content, his speeches denoted a conception of the capacity and character of his auditors which was a compliment to the citizenship of the State of New York. He might have been speaking before its highest court of justice. His general position was thus expressed at Buffalo: "Favoritism in public service is an iniquity that the people will not and should not tolerate; it is an evil which the business men of the country are determined to end. The public are entitled to be assured that the business which is conducted by virtue of the franchises they grant, is conducted as the public interest requires. They desire extensions of facilities; they wish to encourage betterments; they have no inclination to hamper industry; but they are tired of financial jugglery, and they demand proper service. There is no reason why those who are endeavoring to meet fairly public obligations should suffer by the improper practices of others engaged in the same business. The remedy is to provide such regulation of public service as will assure the people that provision has been made for the investigation of every question and that each matter will be decided according to its merits in the light of day." The Governor won his case before the people, and the opposition to the Public Service Commissions Law collapsed.

But, if Governor Hughes has insisted upon the thoroughgoing regulation of public service corporations, he has shown himself ready to make courageous use of his veto power in order that justice may be done them. In 1907, a wave of two-cent passenger fare legislation swept over the country. The same session of the New York legislature which passed the Public Service Commissions Law later passed a two-cent fare bill. Though governors in other States had everywhere signed similar bills, Gov-



ernor Hughes did not hesitate to send a veto message to the legislature. He pointed out that the passage of the bill was an arbitrary action, not preceded by any adequate inquiry into the justice of the rate which it was sought to establish. He said that it was "practically impossible, in view of the nature of the problems and the many questions requiring consideration, for the legislature to deal directly with railroad rates in a satisfactory manner." By the Public Service Commissions Law a body had just been created which was suited and empowered to do this very work. To this body the matter should be referred for proper investigation and just decision. "The action of government should be fair and impartial, and upon this every citizen, whatever his interest, is entitled to insist. We shall make matters not better but worse if to cure one wrong we establish another. The fact that those in control of railroad corporations have been guilty of grossly improper financiering and of illegal and injurious discriminations in charges points clearly to the necessity of effective State action, but does not require or warrant arbitrary reprisals. In dealing with these questions democracy must demonstrate its capacity to act upon deliberation and to deal justly." This action commended itself to the sober second thought of the people and added to the strength of Governor Hughes's position.

A severe test of the efficacy of Governor Hughes's methods occurred in the spring of the present year. The constitution of the State of New York clearly forbade race track gambling. But through a legislative subterfuge it had been permitted to continue, and the evil had reached large proportions. The Governor urged the passage of effective anti-gambling laws and thus came into direct conflict with unscrupulous interests involving great sums of money. The proposed laws passed the lower house of the legislature by a large majority, but were delayed in the Senate and failed of passage by a tie vote. To the best friends of the Governor the situation seemed most doubtful and discouraging. But he was strong enough to be patient. According to his view, he could but do his duty. If the people allowed him to be defeated, it was their affair. Meanwhile, he did not play the role of a defeated man. He went about the State speaking and pleading his case before the people. An election was called to fill a

vacant seat in the Senate, and the Governor spent two or three days speaking in the district. Notwithstanding the apathy or worse of the party organization, the people elected his candidate. In due course the anti-gambling laws were taken up again in a full Senate and passed by a single vote. Up to date, five of the Republican Senators who favored the continuance of race track gambling have been refused renomination by their constituents. Another Senator who at considerable risk left a bed of sickness to give his vote in support of the Governor's measures has just been nominated for Congress. The State chairman of the Democratic party says that race track gambling is no issue in the present campaign in New York, and the Democrats have nominated for the governorship Lieutenant-Governor Chanler, who supported the anti-gambling bills at a critical moment. All this may not, in fact, keep the gambling issue out of the campaign, but goes to show the effect of the Hughes "appeals to the people."

Governor Hughes has not been invariably successful in securing desired action. He was defeated in 1907 and again in 1908 in his attempt to secure the removal by the Senate of an incompetent Superintendent of the Department of Insurance. But each time the minor defeat seems to have prepared the way for a larger victory. There is something in being able to endure a defeat without flinching. One wonders if the Governor has not an unusual insight into the psychology of the public mind. The timeliness of his defeats goes to prove that adversity has its uses. The public is busy. Its reason and moral sense may be fundamentally sound, but, to gain its support, attention must first be won. Interest and feeling must be aroused before action can be secured. What spectacle more calculated to bring an indignant public to the rescue than that of the governor standing alone at the capital, defeated on a measure clearly for the public good, with the machine politicians sneeringly asking what he is going to do about it! Some Governors would have given up and let the will of the bosses prevail. Governor Hughes turned to the people and asked: "What are *you* going to do about it?" The legislators soon heard from home. The people chose to stand with the Governor.

There has been much criticism of Governor Hughes on the ground of his aloofness from the party leaders. He has been said

to lack tact in dealing with them. But there certainly was little reason why he should enter into close relations with the party leaders in his State or rely upon them for advice. He had been nominated in spite of their hostility. The people's confidence in his personality had brought about his election by a large majority, while all of the candidates whom the party leaders had placed on the State ticket with him were defeated. Under such circumstances there was good reason for avoiding entanglement with the party politicians. As a new figure in State politics, elected under exceptional conditions, he did well to proceed with caution and reserve. It is to be expected that with a longer experience in office and a better knowledge of the organization leaders he will come into easier working relations with those whom he can trust to stand for high standards of public service.

Governor Hughes has thus set forth his attitude toward the party workers: "It has been stated that I have not paid sufficient attention to those who are politically active and who bear the burden and heat of the day in political campaigns. It has been said that I regard political activity as a disqualification for public office. Now no cause can be advanced without hard work and it must be the object of zealous devotion. I esteem those who in an honorable manner work for the party. Political activity, by virtue of the experience and knowledge of affairs gained in it, so far from being a disqualification, may be a most important qualification for office. But I want that activity to be of such a character as to leave a man free and independent in the dignity of his manhood to perform the duties of office, if appointed, unembarrassed by improper influences and unaffected by accumulated obligations."

With regard to the matter of executive interference with party management, the Governor has said: "I have steadfastly refrained from becoming associated in any manner with factional controversies. I have no connection with or interest in the ambitions or efforts of rivals for political preferment or political leadership in any locality or in the State at large. I desire to see party activities conducted honorably, the freest expression of popular choice, and to have party organization represent the untrammelled wish of the members of the party without any interference on the part of the Executive. . . . It is of great importance in my

judgment that the discharge of the duties of the governorship should not be embarrassed by attempts at political management. Such is the power of the office that it lends itself easily to efforts at political control, and such a use of the office is, I believe, fraught with danger to the interests of the people of the State. It is far better that the Governor should exercise his office in the interest of the people without being embarrassed by the exigency of maintaining control of party machinery." Here again the Governor is at variance with the practical politics of the day. But how much he gains in official dignity, impartiality of judgment, and strength to keep an eye single to the public good!

Governor Hughes today occupies a position of unique distinction in American public life. He holds high office without seeking it. Free from embarrassing political entanglements, he has shown an unquestioned disinterestedness in the public service. In his record are found courage, patience, and a combination of high intellectual and moral qualities. He stands a figure in public life singularly qualified to excite the enthusiasm and loyalty of that large class of citizens who are at heart always ready to follow an ideal leadership. One might sum up what is most essential in his public attitude by saying that he is the truest kind of a democrat. For he has pressed home the responsibility for good or bad government upon the plain people. He has proposed policies which appeal to their judgment and to their conscience and has made his fellow citizens feel that they themselves will be in the last analysis responsible if these policies fail. Is not this democracy at its best?

The Governor himself has recognized the difficulties in the path of disinterested and impartial public service. As he said the other day: "Walk in the middle of the road and you will get the bricks from both sides." But on the whole the people of his State have rallied strongly to his support and it does not seem possible that they will fail him in the coming test.

## Hull House, Chicago

BY WILLIAM LUDLOW CHENERY  
Of the University of Chicago

Few cities in the world have so strange a population as Chicago. With its half a million Germans it may claim the position of a leading German city, while its quarter of a million Irish together form almost another Dublin. The 167,000 Poles make Chicago a great city of that downtrodden people, and the 100,000 and more Bohemians are in numbers not far from Prague. Add to these the thousands and tens of thousands of Italians, Russians, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Jews, who form distinct colonies, and the stuff from which the "Chicago American" is to come will be realized. In the very center of this vast mixture of nationalities, in 1889 two young women established a home whose purpose was to make Americans. Today the whole world knows the "Hull House" and the names of Miss Jane Addams and of her assistant, Miss Starr, have carried far beyond the limits of Chicago.

Hull House is a comfortable old residence built in 1856, as the suburban home of the gentleman whose name it bears, at a time when the city was a prosperous young town of some thirty or forty thousand people. The house, then suburban, fronts on one of Chicago's great thoroughfares, South Halstead street, which in its long thirty-two miles shows most of the conditions of a great city's life. Polk street crosses South Halstead at Hull House midway between the stock yards to the south and the ship-building yards on the north branch of the Chicago River. For six miles between these two great industries Halstead is lined with butcher shops, dingy and gorgeous saloons, Jewish theatres and Turkish restaurants. Polk street, running west from Hull House, grows rapidly more respectable; "running a mile east to State street, it grows steadily worse and crosses a gilded net-work of vice on the corners of Clark street and Fourth avenue." Hull House is not a charitable organization nor is it a formal institution where food and education, clothes and entertainment are benevolently bestowed upon the neighboring poor; it has nothing of the "great house" munificence and condescension;

it is an experiment in democracy, an experiment in humanity. It bestows food and clothes sometimes, it furnishes opportunities for study and recreation always, but it gives these things in the spirit of exchange; it seems to think that the equality of men means only the equality of opportunity and it seeks to open up the way to wider living to those who cannot attain these chances without aid. As Miss Addams says: "It is the aim of the residents to respond to all sides of the neighborhood life; not to the poor people alone, nor to the well-to-do, nor to the young in contradistinction to the old, but to the neighborhood as a whole, 'men, women and children taken in families as the Lord mixes them.' The activities of Hull House divide themselves into four, possibly more, lines. They are not formally or consciously divided, but separate according to the receptivity of the neighbors. They might be designated as the social, educational and humanitarian. I have added civic—if indeed a settlement of women can be said to perform civic duties. These activities spring from no preconceived notion of what a social settlement should be, but have increased gradually on demand."

Starting in 1889 with the old Hull residence, the buildings have increased with the needs and opportunities until at the present time the settlement covers about a half a block with its various clubs and homes. To the original house have been added the Coffee House with a large theatre above, The Jane Club, The Boys' Club, The Men's Club, The Woman's Club, The Labor Museum, and other buildings, each responding to some need. The most evident thing about all these buildings is their simple beauty and charm. The wealth which enables the University of Chicago to build its vast halls in the noble style of the English universities is lacking to those who plan Hull House and its additions, but a wonderful taste and feeling for the beautiful so pervades the whole series that the present buildings seem most fitting. In the Coffee House the usual three-ply of brick, plaster, and decoration is done away with, and the brick and fireproofing are everywhere visible, but visible with such soft and artistic lines that the result is very pleasing.

The theatre above the Coffee House is decorated with rural paintings; on one side of the room two symbolic figures are represented, a young, agricultural Lincoln and a Tolstoi with his

plow, the patron saint of the nearby Russian colony, and on the opposite wall two landscapes are painted because the residents of Hull House could never agree upon another member of their Hall of Fame. But everywhere throughout the buildings the same wise choosing is evident; the old Hull residence itself is rarely attractive with its well-selected pictures and brass-work, frequently the product of the labors of one of the residents of the settlement.

When Hull House opened its doors in 1889 there were but two residents, Miss Addams and Miss Starr, but the number has rapidly increased until at the present time there are nearly forty residents. Since the construction of the men's apartments, men have been admitted to residence at the House. No university qualification has ever been made in regard to residents, although a majority have always been college people. The expenses of the residents are defrayed by themselves under the direction of a house committee on the plan of a coöperative club. The force of men and women is engaged in self-sustaining occupations, and gives its leisure time to the House. Few salaries are paid and those only for technical services. When vacancies occur applicants for residence who promise to be of value in the settlement are received for six weeks and at the end of that time are voted upon in residents' meeting. Residents defray their own expenses of lodging and board and are pledged to remain for at least two years.

The social work at Hull House is probably most prominent. During the winter nine thousand people came to Hull House weekly either as members of organizations, or as parts of an audience. Among the social organizations the Jane Club is important. This is a coöperative boarding club for young women and it is self-governing. The weekly dues of three dollars meet all current expenses of rent, service, heat, and food.) There are various circles within the Club for social and intellectual purposes and the atmosphere is one of comradeship rather than thrift. The Jane Club nine years ago moved into a house built expressly for its use. There is a similar club for boys, but more important still are the purely social clubs. There are two club houses, one for boys between fifteen and twenty years old and another for young men. Each of these is well equipped with a gymnasium,

baths, a library, pool tables, and bowling alleys. The Boys' Club numbers a thousand members and does valiant service in combating the attractions of the saloons and other loafing centers of vice. The boys and young men have organized various basketball teams and track teams which have been quite successful in contests with other teams from the city.

The Woman's Club was organized with twelve members in 1891, and now has a total of four hundred and fifty. It works along the same lines as the ordinary social woman's club, gives receptions, musicales, holds discussions of current topics and hears lectures. These discussions cover a wide range, and the lectures are frequently given by distinguished people. Besides these three clubs which occupy their own houses, there are numerous others which meet at Hull House. The average membership of these clubs is forty, and they are all self-governing. They are social in character, but frequently give literary programmes. Among them the dramatic clubs are most important. Under the direction of one of the residents, plays are given every winter; sometimes one of Shakspeare's dramas is produced and again George Bernard Shaw or Henrik Ibsen is attempted. Last winter a play written by one of the members of the club was successfully produced. Besides these plays mentioned, the large colony of Greeks, who feel that their history and background are completely ignored by the American in Chicago, welcomes the chance to present old Greek plays in the original. The "Ajax" of Sophocles was given, and "Galatea" and other modern Greek dramas were produced. The Italians too present plays in their own tongue in the Hull House theatre.

But the festival which brings out the Italian colony is the Mardi Gras which is celebrated annually at Hull House. The costumes are sometimes beautiful importations from Italy and sometimes are made from trifles with surprising cleverness and imagination. The Irish, however, are not to be outdone by their darker neighbors, and so they annually give a St. Patrick's Cotillion at Hull House. Dances are given by other organizations constantly throughout the year. In fact dancing classes have been maintained at Hull House from the earliest days. "The residents of the House are increasingly convinced of the value of dancing as a recreative pleasure to young people engaged in the



monotonous work of modern industry, too often entirely sedentary or of a character which calls upon the use of only a few muscles. The well-regulated dancing party not only offers a substitute to the public dancing halls, but it is obviously a wholesome exercise and affords an outlet for the natural high spirits of youth which have been repressed through the long day. Dancing and calisthenic gymnastics, both of which have been always taught at Hull House, are almost the only forms of recreation which unite the muscular activity of a number of people in an orderly and unified social spirit."

Intermingling with the social work of Hull House and frequently growing out of it are the educational efforts of the settlement. The Shakspeare Club, conducted by Miss Starr for the past twelve years, is full of vigor and enthusiasm. The evenings are given to informal reading and discussion and an occasional paper is assigned. The Club has lectures from members of the department of English of the University of Chicago during the winter. Miss Julia Marlowe is an honorary member of the Club and almost invariably meets the members during her stay in Chicago. There are many other classes in English and history, while classes in electricity and other technical branches are offered through the year. Classes in painting, drawing, pottery, and metal work are organized, and likewise cooking and domestic science are taught the children and women, whose ignorance of the home arrangements of America is frequently appalling.

"Several of the Hull House educational enterprises have developed through the effort made to bridge the past life in Europe with American experiences in such wise as to give them both meaning and some sense of relation. The Hull House Labor Museum was in the first instance suggested by many people in the neighborhood who had come directly from country places in Southern Europe in which industrial processes are still carried on by the most primitive methods. It is not unusual to find an old Italian woman holding a distaff and spinning with the simple stick spindle which had certainly been used in the days when David tended his sheep at Bethlehem. We found in the immediate neighborhood at least four varieties of these most primitive methods of spinning and at least three distinct variations of the same spindle put in connection with wheels. It was possible to

arrange these seven methods into historic order and sequence, and to connect the whole with the present method of factory spinning. The same thing was done for weaving, and on every Saturday evening a little exhibit is made of these 'various forms of labor' in the textile industry. Within one room the Syrian, the Greek, the Italian, the Slav, the German, and the Celt enable even the most casual observer to see that there is no break in orderly evolution, if he looks at history from the industrial standpoint. As the occupation itself is cosmopolitan, adapting itself merely to local conditions and materials, so it is possible to connect this old-time craft with the garments of the department stores, quite as the simple human experience of the immigrants may be the foundation of a more inclusive American life. The young people who work in the factories are also given some knowledge of the material which they constantly handle. The Museum contains carefully arranged exhibits of flax, cotton, wool, and silks, and in addition to the textile implements it exhibits the earlier products in various countries." The classes in millinery, dressmaking, cooking, and embroidery are held in the exhibition room. The interest of the classes in this historic background is said to have been most gratifying, and surely wise education can do no more than constantly to reconstruct the daily experience and give it a relation to the past.

The humanitarian efforts of Hull House grew quite naturally as a response to the simpler needs of the community. As a result of the simple requests of mothers, who had to work during the day, to "keep the baby for the day," the Day Nursery arose. Later a building called the Children's House was erected for the purpose of housing all the efforts for the children, but it was built with special reference to the Day Nursery and kindergarten. And thus came the visiting kindergarten for children who are chronically ill or too badly crippled to attend school. By the visiting kindergarteners and teachers the effort is made to give some lessons in manual training, with the end in view of rendering them self-supporting whenever it is possible, although some of the visits are totally given to entertainment. To meet other needs came the Ice and Pure Milk distribution, the Tuberculosis Cottage and the Penny Savings Bank.

Despite Miss Addams's somewhat hesitant avowal of the civic

efforts of a settlement of women, the efforts of Hull House toward the improvement of political conditions have been powerful if indirect. From the earliest years various organizations have arranged for public lectures and discussion. Among these the Working People's Social Science Club was organized in 1890. Its discussion of social problems is said to be always animated and good-natured, although every conceivable shade of opinion, social and economic, is represented. Closely connected with such discussion has been the relation between Hull House and organized labor. Every year some trades-unions have held their meetings at Hull House, and the Chicago branches of two well-known trade organizations were formed at the House. Equal suffrage for women found an association at Hull House, while the Christian Socialism National Association met at Hull House in 1906.

But in all these activities, social, educational, humanitarian and civic, there has been but one aim—to meet the immediate need of the community. As has been said, Hull House holds its activities lightly, as it were in the hollow of its hand, ready to hand them over to others, for there is among the residents a distrust of the institutional and a desire to be free for experiment and the initiation of new enterprises.

## BOOK REVIEWS

THE OFFICIAL AND STATISTICAL REGISTER OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.  
Edited and Compiled by Dunbar Rowland, Director Department of  
Archives and History: Nashville, Tenn., 1904—694 pp.

THE OFFICIAL AND STATISTICAL REGISTER OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.  
Ibid, 1908—1317 pp.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, VOL.  
I., LITERARY AND HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1900-  
1905: Raleigh, 1907—623 pp.

The creation of distinct departments for the preservation of historical material and the cultivation of historical interest is one of the most suggestive movements in the South. It shows that the political and intellectual leaders realize the value of history in the making of culture and citizenship; that the people are responsive to the effort to preserve the records of the past; and that the rigid economy, even parsimony, of other years in regard to intellectual and cultural movements is passing away. The volumes under review partially illustrate the value of the investment so far made, the way in which the publications of two State departments devoted to history have met and cultivated the demand for a better knowledge of the past.

The "Official and Statistical Register of Mississippi" is a worthy undertaking. The two numbers under review form a guide book to the political, and to a less degree, the economic and educational history of the State. There are some features common to both volumes: chronological outlines and tables of the various "dominions" over Mississippi, list of officials in the territory of Mississippi, of United States Senators and Congressmen from 1817 to the present, Federal officers, names of court officers, sketches of contemporary members of the Legislature and both branches of the State Government, and descriptions of the capital and public institutions. Most of these features in common are enlarged in the second volume. They are also there supplemented by complete lists of the officials of the Senatorial period, biographies of the Governors of Mississippi (Territorial and State), a complete military history from the American occupation of

Mississippi to the close of the war with Spain, and a series of maps showing the growth of the State. Such a compilation should prove of service to many classes: for the worker in legislation an indispensable manual; for the historian, a reliable work of reference; and to the traveler, antiquarian, and the local patriot a repository of facts not easily found elsewhere. Indeed, with a similar amount of new material inserted in each succeeding issue, the "Register" should in a few years become a veritable encyclopedia of Mississippi history, politics, and resources, material and intellectual. This is a work to be commended, valuable alike for arousing popular interest and as a reference book for those whose interests in Mississippi are professional.

The initial volume of the North Carolina Historical Commission claims to be nothing more than a reprint of various ephemeral literary and historical efforts. The intrinsic value of its contents and their availability in other form must therefore decide the worth of the book. Some of the reprints are of interest and might easily be overlooked in the regular channels of publication. Such are the sketches of the Wachovia Historical Society, of Pampticoe and Bath, and of Thomas Settle. Others are certainly of no literary and apparently of no historical value. Reference to the original source of publication is usually omitted. Others, also, have already had a prominent and dignified circulation—such as the "First English Settlement in America," the "Genesis of Wake County," and the "Battle of Moore's Creek Bridge," which appeared in the *North Carolina Booklet*. The most valuable features of the volume are the "North Carolina Bibliography, 1902-1905," and the list of "North Carolina Books in the State Library."

When the vast amount of unpublished records and documentary materials in Raleigh are considered, the reviewer is constrained to feel that the Commission, in making a reprint of material of such varied and uncertain value, has not taken an auspicious advantage of its opportunity.

WM. K. BOYD.

SHELBURNE ESSAYS. By Paul Elmer More. Fifth Series. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908—261 pp.

THE QUARTERLY has at various times called attention to the excellence of Mr. More's critical essays as they have appeared in successive volumes. His work is a joy to those who often look in vain for conscientious and balanced contemporary criticism. It is a distinct gain to have such a well-furnished critic writing constantly for the *New York Evening Post* and the *Nation* essays that may with the most imperative propriety be reprinted in such volumes as this. Mr. More has learning—vast learning—without pedantry; the balance that comes from looking before and after, combined with an enthusiastic relish of good books; the precision and accuracy that comes from the scientific method, supplemented by the true romantic spirit.

New editions or centenary celebrations of old writers, or the first publication of freshly discovered material, affords the opportunity of writing about men of the past. Thus he writes of Dickens, Freneau, Thoreau, Longfellow, James Thomson, Chesterfield, and Sir Henry Wotton. His estimates of these men are far removed from the careless and conventional book reviews so characteristic of our present day criticism. The author has, with something of the amazing assiduity of Sainte-Beuve, re-read the authors he writes about. The result is an emphasis on hitherto neglected aspects of a writer's work, a freshly discovered point of view, a re-valuation of the entire output. The essays strike one as final.

By apt quotations and felicitous characterizations Mr. More has the power of interpreting minor writers in such a way as to awaken the interest and curiosity of the reader—for instance, in George Gissing and Sir Henry Wotton. He knows how to call the attention from the sentimental essays of Donald G. Mitchell to his more valuable writings about genuine rural life—his "rare union of the scholar and the farmer, of the love for books and for the soil." He is aware of the limitations of Longfellow, but, in the face of all academic carpers, he maintains that in his rare gift of rhythm and the rarer gift of interest, and especially in his poems on the sea and in his sonnets, he has his permanent place with the poets: "if he did not, like Dante and his peers, build at the great cathedral of song, he did at least add to it a fair and homely

chapel, where also, to one who comes humbly and reverently, the eternal ages watch and wait." Likewise, after a discriminating study of Dickens, he says: "Nothing, indeed, is more foolish than the preposterous wisdom, nothing more imprudent than the perverse prudence, which would withdraw a man from the untroubled fruition of all that Dickens has so bountifully provided."

The essays are full of critical dicta and judgments that one would fain quote did space allow. The pages in the essays on Thoreau about the romantic movement in Germany and New England are worth some volumes that have been written on the subject—keen in their analysis of the difference between romanticism and mediævalism, and subtle in the contrast between the writers of Germany and New England. "Concord," he says, "is remote and provincial in comparison with the Berlin and Jena of those days; it lacks the universality and culture of those centers; above all, it lacks the imposing presence of a Goethe and a Schiller, who, however loosely, were still connected with the romantic brotherhood; but it possessed one great offset—character." The essay on "The Greek Anthology" suggests Mr. More's perennial interest in Greek literature, the knowledge of which is no doubt his touchstone in all critical judgments.

E. M.

---

FOUR VICTORIAN POETS. By Stopford Brooke. New York: George P. Putnam's Sons, 1908—299 pp.

This volume suggests the main tendencies of life and thought in the Victorian era and is an excellent introduction to the poetry of Clough, Matthew Arnold, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and William Morris. It is not the author's first venture into the field, for he has written the best interpretation of Tennyson's poetry in its relation to modern life, and more recently he has written a volume on Browning—by no means so good as the Tennyson volume, however. He shows in all these volumes a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of the religious, political, and scientific tendencies of the nineteenth century, while his knowledge of literature is that of an expert long engaged in the study of English literature. Literature is viewed not in its technical, but in its broadly human, aspects.

Especially valuable in this volume is the account in the intro-

ductory chapter of the transition from the age of Wordsworth to that of Tennyson—that period of a few years when there was such a dearth of original writers, when the tides of national life were running so low. Concise and incisive is the summary of the minor writers who were imitators of Wordsworth or Byron or Keats—"little rivulets of poetry that assumed to be rivers." "They received a gracious welcome from a society which did not desire to be disturbed by ideas," but must be considered as "a parenthesis in the story of our poetry."

Suddenly, however, the change came in the thirties and forties—"deep-seated, wide-spreading emotion, accompanied by serious thinking, stirred the country"—everywhere the stolid conservatism that was a natural reaction against the radicalism of the French Revolution gave way to social and religious unrest. Against this background of the new era Mr. Brooke sketches the four poets already mentioned. There never was an era of literature which needed to be studied more in its relation to religious thought, and of all the religious movements of the time Mr. Brooke has been for a long time a most careful student.

It would be difficult to find better interpretative studies of the four poets. Stress must be laid on the word "interpretative," for the essays are not so critical as they are interpretative. One who knows the writers will find little that is striking in its originality or freshness of treatment. But for the general reader of literature there could be no better introductions to each poet than we have here, or more stimulating guides to a complete survey of their writings. The chapter on Matthew Arnold is the least valuable in the book, perhaps, and that on William Morris, the newest, and most revealing—a judgment that may be due to the present critic's greater familiarity with the former than the latter. The volume ought to have a decided influence in calling renewed attention to men who have been overshadowed by Tennyson and Browning, but who must have a lasting place in the minds and hearts of cultivated men and women.

E. M.



MR. CREWE'S CAREER. By Winston Churchill. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908—498 pp.

The struggle now going on in all parts of the country for purer politics and for the proper regulation of large corporations is the basis of Mr. Churchill's latest novel. Aside from all question of its artistic merit, it is a great human document, worthy of the close attention of all patriotic Americans. Mr. Churchill is too experienced and well trained a novelist to write a mere "problem" novel—there is humor here, pathos, and especially a most romantic love story—but the main interest is the political situation in New Hampshire, and, by implication, of all other States—it is the "springing up of a generation of ideals from a generation of commerce."

The old order of political leadership is typified in Hilary Vane, who from Number Seven in the leading hotel at the capital directs the political life of the State, while Augustus Flint, the president of the Northeastern Railroad, furnishes him with the sinews of war. They have ruled the State in undisputed sovereignty for a generation, making a mockery of representative government. Against them there is a rising tide of indignation—some of it the result of jealousy, some of it but futile sentimentalism, some of it for political aggrandizement. The great common people have begun to think and only need leadership that is sympathetic and intelligent, to keep them on the one hand from a deadly conservatism, and on the other from frenzied radicalism.

Such a leader is in process of training throughout the story—Austen Vane, the son of the big boss. Inheriting from his mother a certain closeness to elemental things in nature, and with an instinctive sympathy for men, he is brought by force of circumstances to see the heartlessness and lawlessness of the railroads which try in vain to win his favor by passes or otherwise. He is not a radical, however; he loves his father and tells him that he can see his point of view, that the system which he has brought to perfection was a natural evolution for its time, but that it is doomed—the practices of such men "violated every principle of free government, and were they to continue, the nation to which we belong would inevitably decay and become the scorn of the world." The allied forces of Hilary Vane and Mr. Flint win their fight in the convention, but that is the last victory, for the people's cause will soon triumph in the reasonable and

moderate Austen Vane, who will be nobly aided in his work of reform by his wife, who is none other than the daughter of Mr. Flint.

E. M.

---

THE AMERICAN NATION: A HISTORY. Volume 23: National Development, 1877-1885. By Edwin Erle Sparks. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1907—xiv., 378 pp.

No volumes of the American Nation series are of more practical value than those which deal with the more recent years of our history. Living at a time when intricate economic problems shape domestic issues, and diplomacy, once so simple in its principles, has become distinctly international in scope and influence, the average mind not only has difficulty in keeping in touch with contemporary movements, but a greater difficulty in collecting from a diffuse magazine and newspaper literature their origin and history. Such a service has been attempted by Professor Sparks. His monograph describes these manifestations of change in production, transportation, machinery, and the incident problems that have made an economic reconstruction more lasting than any political changes. Then follow chapters on the dissensions within the Republican party, the Democratic opposition to the Force Bills, and the election of 1880. The attention of the reader is then turned to another class of domestic problems, Civil Service Reform, the Isthmian Canal, the Chinese Question, the Indian Question, the Tariff and Inland Commerce—all of which form an antecedent to twentieth century affairs. The concluding chapter describes the Presidential election of 1884.

The day of "critical history" for the period here covered has not yet come. All the historians can do for these years is to collect, organize and correlate a vast amount of material. Within such limitations the author has succeeded.

WM. K. BOYD.

---

The latest addition to the series of "French Classics for English Readers" (G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York,) is Molière in two volumes, translated by Professor Curtis Hidden Page, of Columbia University, with an Introduction by Brander Matthews. The excellent translation, together with the superior binding, print and paper, makes these volumes noteworthy in every respect. The publishers and editors have done the public a real service.





